

into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5116. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Military Appeals to review cases of certain individuals discharged from the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5117. A bill to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such spirits were in the possession of (1) the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification under Government supervision as provided by law and regulations, or (2) a wholesale or retail liquor dealer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5118. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5119. A bill providing for the insurance by the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation of membership shares in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5120. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIER:

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an American National Arts Commission, and for the construction of a theater and opera house in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution designating September 17 of each year as "Citizenship Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 380. Resolution favoring certain action against the Government of Czechoslovakia unless John Hvasta, citizen of the United States is released from custody; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Res. 381. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5121. A bill for the relief of Felix Navedo Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5122. A bill for the relief of Claudio Gandola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 5123. A bill for the relief of Walter Huva and Lella Huva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 5124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan H. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H. R. 5125. A bill for the relief of Fong Way Chong, also known as Freddie Fong, and Chu Lau Hing, also known as Lana Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 5126. A bill for the relief of Lucian Roach, doing business as the Riverside Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5127. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleonora O. Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 5128. A bill for the relief of Michael Demcheshen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5129. A bill for the relief of Jose Vieira Alves De Melo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5130. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Connel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. Res. 383. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 3131) for the relief of Raymond B. Jeffrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

381. By the SPEAKER: Petition of San Joaquin County Disaster and Defense Council, Stockton, Calif., relative to civil defense funds to assist in the protection of local facilities and bases which are vital to the national defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

382. Also, petition of Prudencio, Sampaloc, Manila, Philippines, relative to a group of guerrillas known as the Third Sector, Usafe Liberty Crusade with headquarters in the city of Manila; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou great indwelling spirit, who art ever attempting to guide the spirit of man to the realization of abundant life, give us a greater sense of expectancy. Deliver us, we pray, from fears that paralyze the will, and from doubts that breed despair. Let us see Thee, the unchanging, secure foundation, upon which we continue to build a glorious heritage of freedom and fidelity. We need the insight of Thy Spirit and the all-pervading power of Thy love. To this end grant unto us the divine initiative that, as imitators of the Infinite, we may be bearers of light and abundant life to our age. Teach us to look upon our purpose and place in the sun with the same sense of mission of the One who staggered the world by the daringness of His faith, the Man of Galilee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 10, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3782) to authorize a per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CORDON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considering labor-management relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, meeting jointly, were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Pierce Munsey, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a uniform Federal old-age pension system; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Optimist International, at Detroit, Mich., relating to the principles of true democracy in the conduct of the government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution accepting the provisions of Public Law 681, Eighty-first Congress of the United States, relating to fish restoration and management projects

"Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

"Whereas under the provisions of Public Law 681, Eighty-first Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is empowered to cooperate with the States in fish restoration and management projects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the intent of the legislature to accept the provisions of Public Law 681, Eighty-first Congress of the United States, and that the Arizona Game and Fish Commission perform such acts, not in conflict with law, as may be necessary for the establishment and operation of cooperative fish restoration projects in compliance with such act and the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior thereunder."

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 10th instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, reported it on August 11, 1951, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 631) thereon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4601) to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 632) thereon.

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO FREE EUROPE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. DOC. NO. 56)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I submit a report on United States economic and military assistance to free Europe. This report sets forth the observations and conclusions of a subcommittee, of which I was chairman, which in July visited some seven European countries and received oral reports from American representatives in six additional countries.

This visit to Western Europe was undertaken at the invitation of General Eisenhower. The Foreign Relations Committee agreed with the general that it would be most helpful to it and to the Senate as a whole to obtain on-the-spot information as to the nature and scope of the European rearmament effort. We felt this information would be useful to the Senate in its consideration during this session of the mutual security assistance bill, S. 1762, which is now before the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, sitting jointly.

I hope that my colleagues will give this report careful study. There is much in-

formation in the report which has not been made available heretofore. There are, I believe, a number of important conclusions upon which the members of our nine-man bipartisan subcommittee agreed unanimously. It contrains, for example, carefully compiled figures showing the comparative cost of arming a soldier in Europe as compared with arming a soldier in the United States. It contains valuable information on the waning strength of communism and neutralism in Western Europe. It also contains some important conclusions on European morale.

While the trip of this subcommittee was hurried, I think we all found it extremely useful, both to our own country and to the countries we visited or heard from. In 14 days we conferred with the head of State, ranking Cabinet members, and the American Ambassadors in seven countries. We also conferred with American representatives from six other countries. This gave us a rare opportunity to assess the political pulse, as well as the economic condition and defense efforts of these states.

All our conferences with foreign officials were off the record. The things they said, however, helped the subcommittee to formulate its conclusions. Although we kept verbatim transcripts of our meetings with American officials in these countries, a great deal of that information also was highly classified. The committee staff is now in the process of editing these hearings so that the non-classified information may be made public for use during our consideration of the mutual security bill.

I want to commend the members of the subcommittee for their assiduous attention to their duties and for the unanimity of opinion which characterized their actions and found expression in this unanimous report of this bipartisan committee. They were most helpful to the chairman and it was indeed a pleasure to serve with Senators McMAHON, SPARKMAN, GILLETTE, WILEY, SMITH, HICKENLOOPER, LODGE, and BREWSTER.

I want also to extend my thanks to the Departments of State and Defense and to the members of the committee staff, who were most helpful to the subcommittee during its trip.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, without objection, printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1990. A bill for the relief of Rev. Milan Ignacio Hlebs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 1991. A bill relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces;

S. 1992. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status;

S. 1993. A bill to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

S. 1994. A bill to authorize the use of the incomplete submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes; and

S. 1995. A bill to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Air Force of the United States, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 1996. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations in order to eliminate the provision requiring that a payment from a burial association shall be deducted from the burial allowance to a veteran; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 1997. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Shepherds Landing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1998. A bill for the relief of J. Hibbs Buckman and A. Raymond Raff, Jr., executors of the estate of A. Raymond Raff, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MARTIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4386, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON (for Mr. LEHMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. LEHMAN to House bill 4386, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NATIONAL CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD ON RADIO AND TELEVISION—AMENDMENT

Mr. BENTON (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. SALTONSTALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1579) to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

TELEVISION FREQUENCY ASSIGNMENTS, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. BENTON (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. SALTONSTALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) relating to television frequency assignments, construction of new stations, and television programming, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC.,
PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Discussion of the question "Should Spain be in the western alliance?" by himself and Senator MAGNUSON, on July 29, 1951, during broadcast of the Columbia Broadcasting System program, the People's Platform.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

Correspondence between him and Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York Times, dealing with our China policy and Fred Uley's book entitled "The China Story."

By Mr. MARTIN:

Summary of remarks by him before the annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh, Pa., August 10, 1951, on the subject of oaths of loyalty by American citizens.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Editorial entitled "NSRB Chairman," published in the Washington Post of August 11, 1951.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorials discussing the question of the stand of the United States toward communism, published in the Pittsburgh Press of August 9, 1951.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Editorial entitled "Industrial Dispersion," published in the Washington Post of August 13, 1951, and a release from the National Security Resources Board.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Hendrickson	McMahon
Benton	Hennings	Millikin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoyer	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Nixon
Cain	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Hunt	Pastore
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smathers
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ellender	Malone	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Taft
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Welker
Gillette	McClellan	Williams
Green	McFarland	
Hayden	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senators from Indiana

[Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). A quorum is present.

PROTECTION OF LOYAL LABOR UNIONS
AGAINST INFILTRATION BY COMMUNISTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, last Thursday I introduced a bill (S. 975) having as one of its purposes the protection of loyal labor unions against infiltration by Communists and members of communistic organizations.

Key labor organizations are, at times, infiltrated by subversive persons who are members of Communist organizations and fronts, and whose activities disrupt normal peaceful relations and limit or embarrass the choice of loyal citizens in affiliating with loyal labor organizations.

I have the greatest admiration for the efforts of the American Federation of Labor and the CIO to purge their membership rolls of organizations which had been infiltrated and were dominated by Communist elements; and I believe that the legislation which I proposed last week, and which is intended to strengthen their hands, will have their full support.

I have had this problem under consideration for a long time, and have been trying to measure the effects of such legislation as I proposed last week in S. 975. I would not want to sponsor any proposal that would weaken the position of honest and loyal spokesmen for the millions of workmen whose might is the Nation's greatest defense asset.

I believe, however, that some additional legal protection is necessary for both the unions and the employers against the cancerous growth of communism which has threatened their stability.

The bill I have introduced would make it unlawful for any person who is a member of a Communist organization, or Communist-action organization, to become an officer or a representative of any labor organization.

It would withdraw bargaining privileges from any union represented by any such person.

In addition, it would permit an employer to discharge, without liability, any person who is listed in the records of an agency of the Federal or a State Government as a member of an organization designated by the Attorney General as subversive, or who has concealed his membership in such an or-

ganization or has refused to tell a properly constituted legislative committee whether or not he is or has been, knowingly or willingly, a member of such an organization.

Members of the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, have recently recommended that legislation be prepared authorizing withdrawal of any bargaining privileges held by Communist-dominated unions. I believe that if this is done, the other provisions which I have proposed in the bill which I introduced yesterday are necessary corollaries.

So that those of my colleagues who read the RECORD may be fully informed, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill which I introduced last Thursday, S. 975, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 975) to permit the discharge by employers of persons who are members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, and to decertify labor organizations represented by or having officers who are members of such organizations, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.) is amended by renumbering paragraph (15) as paragraph (16) and inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

"(15) Key labor organizations are at times infiltrated by subversive persons who are members of Communist organizations and fronts and whose activities disrupt normal peaceful labor relations and limit or embarrass the choice of loyal citizens in affiliating with loyal labor organizations."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as enacted in the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(g) It shall be unlawful for any person who is a member of a Communist organization, including any Communist-front organization or Communist-action organization, to be or to act as a representative or to be or to act as an officer of a labor organization within the terms of section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (61 Stat. 137-138). Any certification heretofore issued under the provisions of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by section 101 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (61 Stat. 143), with regard to any such person, or any labor organization having such a person as an officer or representative, is hereby declared void."

Sec. 3. Section 5 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as enacted in the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(d) Nothing in this act or any other statute of the United States shall preclude an employer from discharging without liability an employee who appears on the records, in the possession of the Federal Government or a State government, as a member of an organization designated by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive, or who has concealed his membership in such an organization, or who has refused to state to a duly constituted legislative committee whether or not he is or has knowingly or willingly been a member of such an organization."

ACTION ON HOUSE BILLS BY COMMITTEE
ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on a misconception which recurs with some frequency.

Every now and then we get complaints that the Judiciary Committee is not taking prompt action on House bills. Members of the House apparently are being told—by whom I do not know—that when bills come over from the House and are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, they are put in a pigeonhole and do not receive committee consideration. Of course, this is not even close to the truth. I have explained the situation to a number of individual Members of the other body, and yet the false reports persist. I really have no hope of allaying such reports permanently by the short statement I am now making; but at least it can do no harm to put the facts in the RECORD on this occasion.

So far this session, the Committee on the Judiciary has received 297 House bills. Of these 297 bills, 149—a full 50 percent—have been reported to the Senate. Seventy-three bills—approximately 25 percent—have been acted on adversely by the committee, and have been indefinitely postponed. This leaves only 75 bills out of 297 which have not yet been acted upon by the committee.

Mr. President, that is not the whole story; because 52 of those 75 bills upon which no action has been taken are bills which have come to the committee since May 1; that is, which have come to the committee within the period of approximately 90 days. In that 3-month period, the committee has received 126 House bills; and of these bills, 57 already have been reported to the Senate, and 17 have been acted upon adversely. This leaves, as I pointed out, 52 bills, out of the 126 received during the past 3 months, upon which no action has been taken.

Simple arithmetic will demonstrate that of 171 House bills which reached the Judiciary Committee of the Senate before May 1 of this year, all but 23 have been acted upon by the committee. That is less than 14 percent. To put it the other way, the record shows that of all the House bills which have been within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate for 90 days or longer, the committee has acted on more than 86 percent.

I make this statement so that our friends of the other body may know that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate not only has a fixed policy of seeking the promptest possible action on all House bills which come to the committee, but is effectuating that policy in its daily work.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GILLETTE,
OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation of the distinguished minority leader for his action last Thursday in presenting, in the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and myself, the resolution expressing the sorrow of the Senate over the death of Representative Wilson D. Gillette, who represented the Fourteenth District of Pennsylvania.

The passing of Wilson Gillette brings to me a profound sense of personal loss. He was my fine and loyal friend for many years. He served the people of his district with honor and distinction in the General Assembly of Pennsylvania for 10 years prior to his election to the Seventy-seventh Congress in 1941. He served in each succeeding Congress since that time.

Representative Gillette was a courageous and patriotic American. He served his State and Nation with complete fidelity to the highest principles of true Americanism. He was a tireless worker on behalf of his constituents.

He was a kindly, modest man, but was outstanding in integrity, sincerity, and devotion to the public welfare. He will be greatly missed by the people of his district and by his colleagues in the Pennsylvania delegation whom I join in deepest sympathy to his wife and family in their hour of bereavement.

DEATH OF STEPHEN T. EARLY

The VICE PRESIDENT. I wish to express my profound regret and sorrow over the death of Stephen Early. I know I speak the sentiments of all of us who knew him and those who knew of him. I have known Mr. Early for a quarter of a century. He was an able and fair newspaper correspondent in Washington for years before he became press secretary at the White House under President Roosevelt. He later became connected with the Pullman Co., and latterly press secretary again on the death of Mr. Charles Ross. A more loyal, more patriotic American never served the people of this country in any capacity. I particularly deplore his death as a friend and associate. I have been requested to act as an honorary pallbearer at his funeral tomorrow, but because of a previous engagement with some ex-servicemen I shall be unable to perform that honorable mission. I did not want the opportunity to pass without paying my deep respects and my affectionate regard for this great American.

I wish his family and all his friends to know that not only do I entertain these sentiments about him, but I think we all entertain them.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in what the Vice President has said in regard to Stephen Early. The death of Steve Early is a great loss to America and to all of us. It is a tragedy that his career came to an end at a relatively early age. His many friends hoped that he would have many more years of active life.

It is unnecessary for me to recount his accomplishments and his brilliant service as Deputy Secretary of Defense and as press secretary to the late President Roosevelt and to President Truman. He served with high distinction and great devotion. He placed the welfare of his country above all.

As one who knew him for a long time, I feel a deep sense of personal grief. I wish to express my sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the re-

marks of the Vice President and the majority leader. I had known Steve Early for a number of years. Not only was he a very fine public servant but I counted him as one of my dearest friends. I shall miss him very much indeed. I wish to express my condolence to his family.

DEATH OF HERBERT K. WHITE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate noted with sorrow the death of Herbert White, Associated Press photographer, last Friday, in Rochester.

Herb White was one of the finest photographers in America, and he did a splendid job of covering the Senate when he came to Capitol Hill. He was a credit to the profession of journalism, and he will be sadly missed by his friends here in the Senate Chamber and in the Press Galleries.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy and condolence to his family.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also wish to join the majority leader in an expression of regret at the passing of Herb White. Herb White was one of the finest photographers and journalists we had on the Hill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in company with so many others of his good friends in the Senate, I was profoundly shocked to learn of Herbie White's sudden and untimely death last Friday.

Herbie White was known to all of us as the ever-present photographer representing the Associated Press.

Herbie's first mission was to get the picture. He always did. But he was very courteous in the way he did it.

That is what made him outstanding in his own profession, as did the exceptional quality of his work. In exhibitions of the work of photographers of the White House and Capitol Hill his work always stood out for its exceptional quality.

But Herbie White was a great deal more than a photographer. He was a friend. No matter what the pressure of his duties it was always possible for him to find the time to exchange pleasantries and commentary. It was his commentary that inevitably added spice to our daily work. His observations were always keen and piercing, although never unkind.

Herbie White was a great credit to a craft and a profession which is of vital importance in our system where the news is to be reported fairly, promptly, and accurately so that the public may be enlightened and thereby exercise their guiding judgment in the conduct of our Nation's affairs. Pictures are an essential feature of that process because it has been said that one picture tells more than 10,000 words. Herbie White's pictures never failed to tell the story.

I want to pay this personal tribute to Herbie White and to say that I will miss him greatly. My sincere regrets go out as well to his wife and family.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a couple of minutes?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who serves on the

Committee on Appropriations and who has rendered very valuable service. If I may, I should like to say that 35 or 40 years ago I served in the House of Representatives with his distinguished father. He was one of the best men I have ever known, and his son is like unto him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Tennessee. At a later time I expect to talk on the pending bill. However, I rose to say something relative to the passing of Herbert White, who died on Saturday. He was an Associated Press photographer who covered Washington. Mr. White was a young man. He had just passed his forty-third birthday anniversary. He was born in Washington and had worked with the Associated Press since 1932, first gaining newspaper experience with the Washington Times-Herald. During the period of the Second World War he served in the Navy. He returned to civilian life and participated in the activities of Washington as a newspaper photographer and interpreter to the Nation of activities in the Nation's Capital.

As an alert and aggressive newspaper photographer he had many assignments on presidential campaign trains, covering both the campaigns of President Roosevelt and President Truman, also covering the great national conventions. In more recent times his specific assignment with the Associated Press had been the covering of the Senate of the United States.

I believe many of us were fortunate in having had an opportunity not only of seeing his work as a competent photographer and member of the fourth estate, but as one who was both alert in his work and friendly in his dealings with those with whom he came in contact. I know that I speak for many Members of the Senate who had the opportunity of knowing Herbert White when I say that he will be missed in Washington.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, one of the most beloved members of the Senate press and photographers' corps, Herbert K. White, died last Friday in Rochester, N. Y., after a heart attack.

We all knew him as "Herbie" White, a man with a camera who had the common touch, who knew everybody, liked everybody, and was a friend to the high and the low.

Mr. President, I am impressed by the number of people who have stopped me to talk about the passing of Herbie White. He is genuinely mourned not only by Senators, but by the policeman at the door, the elevator operators, and the messengers at the Capitol. They are the people who have the opportunity to judge the real worth of a man and they are unanimous in their high judgment of him.

Herbie White is gone, but his kindness and his friendships will live long in his wake.

Mr. President, Herbie White was one of those rare persons, a native Washingtonian. He was graduated from Central High School in 1927, and went to work for the Washington Times-Herald as an apprentice.

He joined the Associated Press about 1931 and covered the Capitol. It is a compliment to all of us here that Herbie White was known among his colleagues as "The Senator."

When World War II came, Herbie White was in the thick of it with his camera. He was the first photographer to land on the beach in the invasion of Sicily.

Transferred to Panama, he later was sent to the Dutch West Indies. There he was, as he expressed it, "bowled out of bed" one morning by submarine attacks on Aruba, the oil center.

Besides covering the Senate, Herbie White rode the presidential campaign trains, picturing political developments as they occurred.

Mr. President, I have lost a personal friend. Many other Senators have lost a personal friend. The Senate itself has lost a beloved friend. We mourn his passing.

As I feel the great vacuum around Capitol Hill caused by the death of one of the finest friends I have had, I recall to mind the eulogy pronounced by Clarence Darrow over the grave of one of his friends. It is so long since I read it that I cannot quote Darrow verbatim, but roughly here is the thought:

The sun shall never shine so bright again,
The stars shall never gleam so white again,
The autumn leaves have lost some of their
old-time tint of red and brown.
The world shall never seem so good again—
For another great man is dead.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the August 9 issue of the American Aviation Daily there appears an article which should enlist the attention of committees of Congress, especially the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The article is headed "Air traffic control—Tragedy in the making." I shall read the first paragraph of the article and invite the attention of my colleagues to the entire article. I read the first paragraph:

The record-making performance and safety of operation by the airlines of the United States stands little chance of "weathering" the coming fall and winter. The delays, cancellations, and even accidents which plagued airline operation in 1946-47 might well mark the 1951-52 winter season.

There follow some very carefully analyzed and pointed statements which in my opinion should receive immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL—TRAGEDY IN THE MAKING

The record making performance and safety of operation by the airlines of the United States stand little chance of "weathering" the coming fall and winter. The delays, cancellations, and even accidents which plagued airline operation in 1946-47 might well mark the 1951-52 winter season.

The remarkable achievements of the industry during the past 5 years in overcoming the operational problems posed by all-weather flying are right now being undermined in a manner and to a degree which

makes a recovery this year seem difficult if not impossible.

This is the result of the wholesale military recall of airport and air traffic controllers who last month handled more than a million fixed postings, on the Federal Airways. It is not purely a civil problem. More than 300,000 of these fixed postings were military. Also, between 15-20 percent of the landings and take-offs at all 175 tower-controlled civil airports are made by military airplanes. Already the military have had to cancel mass training flights as a direct result of Federal Airways personnel shortages.

EXPERIENCE LEVEL DROPPING

In region I, including the high density New York-Boston-Washington area, 62 percent of the controllers now directing traffic have had less than 1 year in their present grades. In this 62 percent are 87 with less than 3 months in grade and 38 more with less than 6 months. Of the airport controllers in this region, 37 percent have less than 1 year on their present jobs. Of this 140 airport controllers, 58 have less than 3 months' experience in grade.

Of 1,551 authorized air route traffic controllers, 150 have been recalled since June 1950. Twenty-seven have been deferred and 32 more are scheduled for recall before December. Of those remaining, 209 are in the Active Reserves, 407 Inactive Reserves.

There are 1,846 authorized airport controller positions. Of these, 109 have been recalled to service, 12 are deferred, and 17 are scheduled to go before the end of the year. One hundred and thirty-five of those remaining are in the active Reserve, and 337 are in the inactive Reserves. The situation is almost as bad with communications men and electronic technicians.

RESERVISTS FOR REPLACEMENT

Replacements for these men have to come from the Civil Service register, where veterans get preference. The result is that replacements have already raised the number of reservists in these positions to a point above the level when the recalls were initiated. Attempts to bypass the civil-service register have been unsuccessful.

This country is building a billion-dollar traffic-control system scheduled for completion after 1960. Millions spent to date have been invested in equipment aimed at bringing immediate relief to the Nation's congested airways. Automatic operation has been sacrificed to gain time. This is the transition system, for a period during which the related sciences required for automatic control are being developed.

The human being is the key to today's air traffic control. He is aided by a vast array of mechanical and electronic aids which require intelligent and informed monitoring and interpretation. When this is missing, the system breaks down. And the system has broken down. On three separate occasions in the past few months, months during which weather offers no real problems, the system has bogged down hopelessly in critical areas. In the first case, typical of all three instances, some 20 scheduled operations by the Strategic Air Command had to be cancelled. At the same time one airline had 51 flights delayed over 5 hours and another 17 flights delayed more than 9 hours.

Both civil and military traffic on the airways is increasing and the defense planners are scheduling even greater responsibilities for this group in the event of further mobilization. No solution is in sight.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3973)

making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. STIGLER, Mr. BATES of Kentucky, Mr. CANNON, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2736) to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3911) to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

CIVIL-FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of Friday last, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 4386, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall be pleased if Senators will listen to what I have to say. I shall be brief.

I wish to point out that the bill affects nearly every State of the Union. Before going into the various items of appropriations contained in the bill reported to the Senate last Saturday by the Senate Appropriations Committee, I desire to make a general statement concerning the bill and the difference between the Senate version and the House version of the bill. From this statement, I hope Senators may see a little more clearly the differences between the two versions of the bill.

The House passed the bill in the early part of June, and it came to the Senate. The Senate committee has been considering the bill very vigorously and very actively ever since then. I hold in my hand a copy of the printed hearings, and the size of this volume indicates the immense amount of testimony which has been taken in regard to every item in the bill.

The bill as passed by the House appropriates \$514,427,000 for civil functions. The Senate committee has reported the bill to the Senate in the amount of \$637,-

278,213, or a difference of \$122,850,813. Of that amount, however, \$21,215,000 was recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget after the Kansas floods. The House did not pass on that item at all. Deducting the item of \$21,215,000, the difference between the two versions of the bill is \$101,635,813. In other words, the Senate committee voted to increase the appropriations made by the House of Representatives in the amount of \$101,635,813, making a total of \$627,278,213. I ask Senators to keep those figures in mind, in view of what I shall discuss almost immediately.

At first sight, Mr. President, this seems to be an enormous increase, being a little less than a 20-percent increase. However, when we come to consider the facts as they exist, I am constrained to believe that the Senate will take the same view that its Appropriations Committee has taken.

I wish to point out the differences. There are five main differences between the House version and the Senate committee's version of the bill.

1. PLANNING MONEY

The first one is what is known as planning money. Dams cannot be built on rivers without having plans made beforehand. Reservoirs cannot be built without having plans made beforehand. Planning money is most important, of course.

Both during my experience in the Congress and before then, planning money for the Corps of Engineers has been appropriated before dams or reservoirs were begun. The planning money recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for 1952, including that carried in the supplemental budget received last week, amounted to \$3,700,000. The House voted to eliminate all appropriations for planning money; the House voted to stop planning entirely, so far as this bill is concerned.

When the bill reached the Senate committee under those circumstances, Mr. President, we felt that the elimination of appropriations for planning was unwise. That was the attitude of not merely one member of the committee, but of a majority of the committee. In fact, I think the vote was 18 to 4, if I recall the figures correctly. On this particular item, there was no division at all.

Think of it a moment, Mr. President: the United States Government is giving to nations scattered over almost all the world vast sums of money. This bill, as it is reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee, calls for appropriations of \$637,278,213. By way of contrast, what is proposed to be given by the United States to the other nations of the world, by means of action proposed to be taken at this session of Congress? The total is \$8,500,000,000. Will no planning money be provided in that measure? Oh, no; considerable sums of the money the United States provides to foreign nations in that bill are to be used for planning; the United States Government furnishes money for planning for great projects all over the world. No limitation is imposed in that respect. During the present year, all kinds of great works will be planned.

Yet, while we provide the funds for the planning of projects in virtually all the other countries of the world, the House has determined that the United States should not use planning money for any purpose in connection with projects in the United States, and the House voted to eliminate from the bill all appropriations of planning money.

Mr. President, as I have said, the planning money recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for 1952, including that carried in the supplemental budget which was received last week, amounts to \$3,700,000, of which \$1,000,000 is for rivers and harbors and \$2,700,000 is for flood control. The House voted to eliminate those appropriations from the bill.

Mr. President, as I have suggested, the United States Government furnishes money for nations of Africa and Asia and South America and virtually all other areas of the world; and planning money is provided for projects in those foreign countries, as I shall point out in a moment. But in America, according to the House, planning money is excluded. I do not believe there is a single Senator who will not say that the Senate committee was entirely justified when it voted for the restoration of \$3,700,000 of planning money.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator wait a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall then be glad to yield to him. At this point I merely wish to show how it operates. I shall refer to one illustration in particular, though there are many illustrations which could be used. I note by the morning press that the Economic Cooperation Administration has drawn a contract with three engineering firms, who are to make a study in connection with projects of this kind in Burma. It is proposed to put a stop to it in the United States, but we furnish the money with which to begin the planning of similar great projects in Burma. Mr. President, think of it for a moment. An appropriation of \$3,700,000 is sought for use in our own country, and the House refuses to provide it, but ECA proposes to furnish \$1,500,000 for planning money in Burma.

I shall yield to the Senator from New Mexico in a moment. I am sure he will agree with me. I wonder whether there is a Senator in this body who would say that we ought to furnish planning money for Burma and Liberia. I noticed in the press yesterday that a large amount is to be spent to increase electrical generation in Liberia, in Afghanistan, and in various other countries; but when it comes to planning money for America the House says, "No; we are going to stop it; we are going to effect a saving." I do not believe there is a Senator who will say that we ought to stop it. Those who saw fit to deny planning money for American projects raise no question as to the necessity of planning money for foreign projects.

The total estimates for the Corps of Engineers, civil functions, amount to \$646,059,843; all of which, of course, is

classified in some quarters as pork-barrel funds; and the House made a 20-percent cut. But last year the House conferees fought the Senate conferees with the utmost vigor, trying to insure an appropriation of \$2,500,000,000 for the Economic Cooperation Administration in order that adequate plans might be made in Burma and elsewhere. I now yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In line with what the Senator from Tennessee has been saying on the subject of planning money, is it not a fact that, unless we provide planning money for use within the United States, it will in the future be impossible for the United States to give money to Burma or to any other country in the world?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, that is so; and that is why I said a moment ago that I do not believe there is a Senator who will vote against this amendment when his name is called. I yield further to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the over-all picture, is it not a fact that, after weeks of hearings by the subcommittee, during which time they listened to the justification of the various items of this bill, and after weeks of hard work, under the leadership of the Senator from Tennessee, and notwithstanding the fact that the amount is increased by the Senate committee to the extent of \$122,000,000, it is still under the 1952 estimate by \$25,000,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not also a fact that, even after weeks of deliberations and hearings, the total amount for the items submitted by the Senate committee is still more than \$8,000,000 less than the 1951 appropriation?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct. I wish to say here and now that I am one of those old-fashioned men who believe that Senators and Representatives are elected by the people for the purpose of legislating in the interest of America first. If we can assist our neighbors and extend charity to them at times, well and good. But I do not believe in the doctrine that we should turn over unlimited sums of money for the purpose of furthering projects abroad, while we deny similar projects to our own people. I doubt whether it is constitutional. It may be said by some that the Constitution is an old-fashioned doctrine and that no one should pay any attention to it in these days. I am still old-fashioned enough to believe in the Constitution. I also believe in America, and I believe in America first. I believe America comes first as against all other nations.

Mr. President, I come now to a discussion of the sum of \$3,700,000 for planning. In this connection I desire to speak a word about projects which are under construction.

2. PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Projects now under construction are the Buford Dam in Georgia, the Albeni Falls Reservoir in Idaho, the Red River of the North in Minnesota, the Jemez-Hamus-Canyon Reservoir in New Mexico, the Cheatham lock and dam in

Tennessee, St. Anthony Falls in Minnesota, and the Oahe Reservoir in South Dakota, for which there was a request from the Bureau of the Budget for a total of \$20,770,000. These projects have already been let out to contractors and all of them are partially completed and some of them are more than half completed. The Government has a contract with various contractors to build these projects, and that contract provides that if the Government stops work on them the Government will pay the contractors the cost of stopping the work. General Pick, Chief of Engineers, and many other witnesses from the Corps of Engineers say that it will cost one-third of the entire amount, namely, one-third of the \$20,770,000, to stop that work. The contractors will have to discharge their forces. They must either give up their equipment or leave it exposed to the weather. Their whole organization will be disrupted. Who will pay for it? The contractor? Not at all. The United States Government will pay for it, and one-third of the \$20,770,000, or approximately \$7,000,000, will simply be lost by the Government, in the event the Government does not go ahead with the project.

In other words, while we are building dams and reservoirs and other such projects in foreign countries, with no limitation of any kind, nature, or description—and I have no doubt we will continue building them, certainly if the ECA bill passes—it is proposed to stop such work in our own country. Is that right or just? Is that fair to our own people? I think it is not.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The able and distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee made reference to the item in the appropriation bill of \$1,500,000 for the improvement of the upper harbor on the Mississippi River at Minneapolis. That construction is under way at this time, and railroad bridges are being moved. In the event the appropriation should not be made for the continuance of this project we would have to replace the railroad bridges or reconstruct them. It would be necessary to spend at least a million dollars or possibly a million and a quarters dollars to reestablish the bridges, as well as other construction which has been torn down in order to construct the locks and the dam. For that reason, Mr. President, the committee felt it was wiser to continue the construction of the locks in the harbor than to replace bridges.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct. Not only is it proposed to stop work so far as these seven dams and reservoirs are concerned, but we are penalizing the American Government tremendously in order to stop the work. For my part and for the committee's part—and the vote in the committee was overwhelming—I think it would be discriminating against the United States to furnish money for the fiscal year 1952 to continue projects now under construction in foreign countries, and do nothing in our own country.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I am sure every Member of the Senate is impressed with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and the vigor with which he is pressing his case. It was my privilege to serve on the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House for a number of years.

Mr. McKELLAR. I recall it well.

Mr. CASE. I also wish to commend the action of the chairman and the committee on the presentation of the need for continuing construction on the Missouri River. The committee recognizes the realities of the situation, and, in approving the continuation of the program as outlined by the Army engineers, is doing what it can to bring to fruition a comprehensive plan for the control of the Missouri River.

The disastrous floods in Kansas City and St. Louis are evidence of the fact that the sooner the program is completed the sooner people will have protection from such disasters. The committee has approved the Fall River Basin, Fort Randall Reservoir, and Oahe Reservoir in South Dakota and North Dakota. The action of the committee in its realistic approach to the subject is worthy of the attention of the whole country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I thoroughly and wholeheartedly agree with the position he is taking on the floor with reference to the pending bill. It was the kindness of the distinguished chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee that permitted the reopening of certain phases of the hearings at the time of the flood situation in Kansas.

I note with particular satisfaction and pride that the State of Kansas was included in the committee's consideration of the pending measure, including the Hutchinson project, the Strawn Reservoir, the Topeka project, the Toronto Reservoir, and the Turtle Creek Reservoir.

I noted what the Senator had to say about the planning money. I note that the committee has considered the appropriation of planning money for one of the projects to the extent of \$250,000. I think that is a most constructive step. I think the committee has done a magnificent job.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas with all my heart.

Mr. President, we have already accounted for more than \$25,000,000 of the increase in the bill made by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I come next to new projects. We have four new starts or new projects in the bill. For what purpose were they recommended by the President? They are four projects from which additional electricity for war purposes primarily is intended to be obtained. The four new

projects were recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers, by the President, and by the Bureau of the Budget. They all say the projects will be of vital necessity in the event we continue to have trouble in the east. I wish to state what the projects are, and how much they amount to.

They are the Dalles lock and dam in Oregon, \$18,000,000; the Ice Harbor lock and dam in Washington State; \$4,000,000; Old Hickory Dam in Tennessee, \$8,000,000; Gavins Point Reservoir in Nebraska, \$5,000,000.

The total budget estimate for these projects is \$35,000,000. But the Senate committee reduced the budget estimate by \$6,500,000. The projects I have mentioned account for the greater portion of the increase in the appropriation. The Dalles lock and dam project was reduced by \$4,000,000. The Old Hickory lock and dam project in Tennessee was reduced by \$2,000,000. The Gavins Point Reservoir project was reduced by \$500,000.

Mr. President, we are furnishing money to build new projects to countries that we call friends, but some of them are not showing the friendship which I think they ought to show. However, according to the House bill, we must absolutely refuse to build any new projects at home. We must eliminate them. America must supply money to all the other countries of the world, but must not build new projects, such as hydro-electric projects or dams, which would repay to the Government every cent of the money spent in their construction. There can be no question about that. Some of our leading dams are now paying the Government back.

It may be asked why new projects were started. They were started for the reasons which I have stated. If the ECA bill passes, vast sums of money for the same kinds of projects in other countries will be provided. There will be no prohibition against building new projects in other countries, while in America "no new projects" is the word. I did not vote for the first ECA bill. My colleagues outvoted me. However, I accepted it. We are trying to make the best of it. We are trying to be kind to all the world. We are trying to do the right thing to all the world. But we hear the slogan, "no new projects." Is that right? Is it right to throw our people out of employment, and discontinue projects, at an enormous cost to the Government?

As I have previously stated, I voted against the first ECA bill. I have always doubted the wisdom of our giving money to foreign countries under the conditions which now exist in the world. But, as I have said, I accepted the majority views of my colleagues, and we have been trying to get along. I thought—and a very large majority of the committee thought—that the four dams and reservoirs to which I have referred ought to be provided for.

We come to the next item, for "Surveys and examinations." Before dams or reservoirs can be built there must be examinations. We cannot simply look at the map and say that we are going to build a dam in Indiana, Idaho, Mississippi or some other State. The project

must be investigated. The amount involved for this item is very small. It is only \$6,000,000. The House eliminated it entirely. Ought we to put it back? It is proposed to stop the enormous works which we have been constructing along this line for many years? I say that that is not right. If we can furnish money for exploration and surveys in foreign countries, why should we stop making appropriations for surveys in our own country?

The last item is in connection with the Kansas and Missouri floods. One day a few weeks ago we were taking testimony concerning the building of three dams in northern Kansas. General Pick, the Chief of Engineers, was the principal witness. He earnestly argued in favor of what is known as the Tuttle Creek Reservoir and Dam in Kansas. This was before the floods came. This was before the levees broke. We found that that dam had been authorized for several years, but because of local differences the dam had not been built.

A remarkable thing occurred. I digress here long enough to mention it. The day before the flood came we were examining General Pick. General Pick said that if the Tuttle Creek Dam had been built as the Congress had directed, there would have been no Kansas City flood. He explained his reasons. In my judgment, there is not a doubt that if the Tuttle Creek Dam had been built we would not have had to spend \$25,000,000 to help the flood sufferers in Kansas and Missouri.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, let me say of General Pick that he is my kind of man. He was testifying on the afternoon before the flood. He heard of the great tragedy in Kansas City. Did he send a staff member out there to see about it? Did he send a subordinate, as he might have done, to see about it? Not at all. He went himself, and stayed there until he found out all about it, and what could be done to help remedy the situation. The Congress literally spent \$25,000,000 to aid people who suffered so greatly from the flood. It was not our purpose to pay them for all the damage, of course, but merely to relieve suffering.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for bringing in this fine report, affecting as it does some of our domestic problems. I appreciate very much his statement as to our attitude in regard to taking care of our own people. I expect to devote some time to a discussion of the pending legislation when I obtain recognition in my own right this afternoon or tomorrow during the course of the debate.

However, I wish to say that we in Kansas and the Missouri Basin are indebted to the Senator from Tennessee and the other members of the Appropriations Committee for recommending funds for plans for preliminary studies, and for the commencement of some new

projects, which are so vital in a program of flood protection and the control of the water runoff in the Missouri Basin.

We have gone through what I am told is one of the most disastrous floods in the Nation's history. The damage in the Kansas River Basin has amounted to a billion dollars. It will be decades before the economic losses suffered because of the flood will be overcome.

When I enter into a general discussion of the subject in my own time I expect to dwell at length on some of the problems. Again let me say that we are deeply indebted to the Senator from Tennessee for his many courtesies and kindnesses.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appreciate the kind words of the Senator.

Mr. President, just think what we would have saved if the plan of the Engineers had been carried out. We would have saved \$25,000,000 in cash, which we appropriated for relief during the last flood. I am afraid that there will be some opposition to increasing this appropriation \$100,000,000. However, we must remember that a \$21,000,000 item was brought in after the Kansas flood. In my judgment the committee did its full duty in appropriating the additional \$100,000,000.

Of course, some people always think there is "pork" in every bill of this kind. There is no "pork" in it, Mr. President. The bill concerns the building up of our country. I do not know of any other country which has been built up as much as has our country in the past few years by the use of Federal money in constructing dams and in creating reservoirs in the great West, where untillable land has been made tillable and where deserts have been brought under cultivation. Some wonderful work has been done.

Mr. President, just one further word. Our committee has worked on the bill since the 28th day of June, as I recall. We have taken the testimony which I showed the Senate a moment ago, consisting of 1,634 pages. We have carefully and honestly considered every item in the bill. I want to say to the Senate that I very greatly hope that the bill can be passed at the earliest possible moment. I hope that if we cannot put ourselves on the same basis, at least we can place the United States in a secondary position to other nations of the world to whom we are literally shoveling out money to the extent of \$8,500,000,000 to be used as they please, while at the same time the construction of great dams in our country has been stopped.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Under the customary procedure of the Senate, committee amendments will be first considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to join the other Members of the Senate in expressing my appreciation to the eminent chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the hard work he has done on this bill and the careful

consideration which he and all other members of the committee have given to the subject.

As the Senator from Tennessee has stated, the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee calls for an increase in the amount of \$123,000,000 in the appropriations voted by the House of Representatives. This is an increase from \$514,000,000 to \$637,000,000. I suppose that the practical reason for the voting of that increase by the committee was the great flood which began in Kansas in July and swept on through Kansas and down the Missouri River and down the Mississippi River. Although this was not particularly mentioned in the report, probably as a practical matter, it was that great flood which led to the increase which the committee voted in the appropriations.

I am sure that the committee has been careful in the consideration which it has given to the bill. The committee has wished to protect itself against a charge that if it did not recommend such appropriations and if a flood came in the future, the fault might be that of the committee. I suppose all of us feel a certain sense of solemnity about this subject, lest we fail to take steps which might prevent future floods.

So, Mr. President, I fully appreciate the position of the committee, and I do not desire in any sense to reproach the committee for the attitude it has taken. I do not wish to set myself up as superior in knowledge in any degree to the committee.

However, Mr. President, I think there are certain other considerations which we should bear in mind. I shall try to be brief in mentioning them.

MUCH OF COMMITTEE INCREASE IS NOT FOR FLOOD CONTROL

In the first place, \$50,000,000 of the \$123,000,000 of increase are not connected in any direct sense with flood control, but are included in the recommended appropriations for rivers and harbors primarily navigation projects, and will not give any immediate protection against floods.

In the second place, it still is not certain whether the so-called Pick-Sloan plan, or the shotgun marriage of the plan of the Corps of Army Engineers and the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the Missouri Valley, is the best way to control floods in that area. It is my own feeling that the Pick-Sloan plan should be modified so as to provide for a greater number of small retention dams in the tributary rivers, to check the flow of water as it comes into the rivers; and, secondly, I believe that the entire program of flood control could perhaps more properly be directed at upstream control, and reforestation, the re-seeding of barren hillsides, the development of grasses which will retain moisture, contour plowing, terracing, and in general what is known as upstream engineering.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT FLOOD CONTROL IMPOSSIBLE

I think we must also bear in mind that probably no system, however effective, could have prevented the floods in Kansas. There we had an almost unique ex-

perience, namely, 30 days of extremely heavy rainfall, followed by 1½ days during which the rainfall amounted to as much as 11 inches, as I recall.

Mr. President, during the last war I spent some time in the South Pacific, and a portion of the time I was on the western part of the island of New Britain, which has one of the heaviest rainfalls in the world, amounting to approximately 365 inches a year. This compares with the 33 inches in Chicago and from 20 to 25 inches on an average, I believe, in Kansas. One day in New Britain there was a rainfall of 14 inches. I never want to see anything like that again. I know that a rainfall of from 10 to 14 inches in one day on the Great Plains creates an amount of water which is virtually uncontrollable, but it probably occurs only once in a century in any part of our country.

So, although we realize and deprecate the damage which has been caused, and although we wish to protect ourselves against future damage, I think we must also consider the factor that if we were to protect every area of the United States against the possibility of a flood such as the one which occurred in Kansas, we would have to cover the country and construct in all its streams the most elaborate set of dams and precautionary works, the cost of which probably would run into the tens and tens of billions of dollars. In other words, try as hard as we may, there are some catastrophes against which man cannot provide.

AN INFLATIONARY FLOOD CAN BE DISASTROUS, TOO

Mr. President, I quite well realize how the fear of another possible flood impressed the committee itself. As I have said, I wish to pay tribute to the committee's motives. I, too, am afraid of another flood. However, not only am I afraid of a flood of water, but I am also afraid of a flood of inflation which might sweep over the country and might take away, not the topsoil, but the middle class and the economic stability of the Nation. So, the fiscal condition of the country compels us to examine carefully each and every appropriation with which we are confronted and to deal with it in terms of the general budgetary situation which we have to face.

So far as I can see, the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1951-52 is at least \$12,000,000,000 and more probably \$20,000,000,000 in the red. I should like to justify those figures, if I may.

In January the President sent to Congress a budget calling for appropriations of \$71,500,000,000. Since then, the President has sent to Congress a request for a further appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for foreign aid. The total requests which have come to us from the administration amount, at a conservative estimate, to approximately \$73,000,000,000 of expenditures for the coming year. I know there is some uncertainty about the totals, particularly in connection with national defense, because we are being asked to appropriate for national defense large sums of money which it is said will not be spent during the coming year, and, therefore, in those cases the appropriation perhaps approaches

an authorization, rather than an actual expenditure. Nevertheless, Mr. President, if we are most charitable by saying that of the \$56,000,000,000 of appropriations voted last week by the House of Representatives for national defense, only from \$40,000,000,000 to \$41,000,000,000 will be spent, there are still large items which the weight of probability indicates, so far as I can ascertain, will be above and in addition to those figures.

INCREASED MILITARY SPENDING IN PROSPECT

In that connection I should like to mention the large program for the construction of military bases abroad—a very necessary program, in my judgment, and one which will run into the billions of dollars in expense, and which may be accelerated far beyond present plans. If it is accelerated in speed, of necessity it will call for much larger expenditures during the coming year than now are contemplated.

We also have "in the works" the possibility of enlarging the Air Force from the present budgeted figure of 95 groups to a total of possibly 135 groups or, as others have advocated, 150 or even 163 groups. If that program is carried through, there will have to be further appropriations and expenditures in the amount of additional billions of dollars.

Then we have the question of the Korean war. It is my understanding that the present budgetary figures are predicated on the assumption that the Korean war expenditures will be liquidated by the end of this year, and that virtually no allowance is made for the continuation of hostilities beyond the end of December. Mr. President, that is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but I think it is very uncertain that we can count on it. If we merely carry on at the present rate that will be at a monthly added cost of from four to five hundred million dollars or a yearly total of about \$5,000,000,000.

Therefore, from all these sources—military bases, expansion of the Air Force, continuation of the Korean war, and other items—I think we can look forward to the fact that the governmental expenditures for the coming year will be not the \$71,500,000,000 which the administration requested in January, or the \$73,000,000,000 of requests, or the \$68,400,000,000 which I understand the assistant director of the Bureau of the Budget stated on June 29 before the Senate Finance Committee was his estimate of the expenditures, but in all probability at least \$80,000,000,000, and perhaps more.

PROSPECTIVE REVENUES INADEQUATE TO STOP INFLATION

What do we have on the income side, Mr. President? The Treasury sent to us in January an estimate of the fiscal yields for 1951-52. The Treasury then estimated that the yield of present taxes during the present fiscal year would be approximately \$55,000,000,000. I consider that to be an underestimate; I think the national income has increased appreciably more than the Treasury believed it would increase at the time when the Treasury made its estimate. Furthermore, there has been an increase, not merely in real in-

come, but in the general price level, and that will increase the amount of the total receipts.

Some weeks ago, I made an estimate that the expected yield of present taxes for the fiscal year 1951-52 would be approximately \$61,000,000,000. I was interested in learning this morning that the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, working independently, had reached an estimate almost identical with that of mine. They fixed the estimated yield at \$61,400,000,000. Of course, there is a certain margin of error in both estimates.

Nevertheless, the contrast between the \$80,000,000,000, which I submit is our likely expenditure, and the sum of \$61,000,000,000, which we have in sight, leads to a staggering deficit of \$19,000,000,000. It may be reasoned that the deficit may be only \$12,000,000,000, but, on the other hand, it may be more than \$19,000,000,000.

Mr. President, what will happen if we have a deficit of this magnitude? In the old days, what happened was that the Government printed additional money to make good the deficit, and there was an immediate increase in the quantity of money in circulation; and that meant an increase in prices. That, in large part, was the history of the Civil War; and was what caused so much trouble in the Civil War. I may say there was inflation in the North and the inflation in the South equally damaging both civilizations and both sections of the country.

Nowadays, however, we act in a somewhat more sophisticated fashion. The Government does not issue the money outright, but it goes to the banks to borrow money, because, with a deficit of \$19,000,000,000, we cannot expect the people of the country to save that amount out of their income; while a portion of the \$19,000,000,000 can perhaps be derived from savings, the major portion will have to be obtained from the banks.

DEFICIT WILL CAUSE CREATION OF CHECKBOOK MONEY

What will happen? The Treasury will go to the banks and ask them to make loans to the Government of a certain percentage of their capital and surplus. The banks will make the loans, but they will make the loans in the form of entering upon their books checking accounts, against which the Government will draw. We will have, not the issuance of paper money, but the creation of checkbook money. This will be legalized and legitimized by being recognized as debt rather than an issuance of paper money and will have interest paid upon it. But, like the issuance of paper money, it will be the creation of additional monetary purchasing power, an increase in purchasing power much greater than the increase in the quantity of goods which may be purchased, and upon which the increased purchasing power will be expended. When we increase the quantity of money and credit, opposite the goods, more rapidly than we increase the quantity of goods for which the money is offered, the result is an increase in the price level, and we have what is described as inflation.

WE NEED DAMS TO HOLD BACK THE FLOOD OF INFLATION

Mr. President, we have seen the flood of waters which has descended upon the helpless towns and cities in Kansas and Missouri, but it is more difficult to visualize the flood of inflation which is suspended over the Nation, and which we are feeding here on the floors of Congress when we pass bills making great appropriations.

The rains of appropriations are beginning to descend. The capacity of the ground to soak up the water is limited, and pretty soon the waters of inflation, unless we do something to stop them, will burst upon the Nation, and we shall have, not a 5-percent, but a 10- or 15- or 20-percent increase in the price level.

What is the result of such an increase? It decreases the real income of everyone who is on an annuity. It decreases the real income of all those who draw interest on bonds, all those who have fixed incomes; and that applies not merely to widows and orphans, but to churches and institutions. Salaried folk never get their salaries increased in the same ratio as that by which prices rise. They take home, week after week, approximately the same amount of money; but they find that each week their money will buy less and less; and so they will be driven down more and more to a lower standard of life. Colleges and churches will be put in difficult situations, because their fixed incomes will yield less and less.

The value of insurance policies will diminish. People who have saved the hard way and accumulated what they thought was a protection against death will find the value of their savings cut away. What is likely to happen is that the great middle class of America, or at least the nonspeculative portion of the middle class of America, will be wiped out, and America will become more and more divided between rich speculators, at the top, and impoverished groups at the bottom. Moreover, industrial strife will increase because it will be hard to keep wages in pace with the increase in the cost of living, and strikes will result.

INFLATION WOULD ENDANGER OUR FREEDOMS

Mr. President, if that day were ever to come to the United States, the political stability of the Nation would be threatened, and we would be in for very bad times, indeed. So I hope that we can take into our thoughts, not merely floods of water, but prospective floods of inflation—I repeat, prospective floods of inflation—and that we will try to build dams here on the floor of the Senate to check the rushing waters of Government expenditure, which are threatening to destroy and carry away the very fabric of the Nation.

Mr. President, that is a hard job. Whenever we approach an individual appropriation bill, and a reduction is proposed, it is immediately replied that the item in question is small in comparison with the total amount to be expended. Recently, on the floor of the Senate, a motion was made to save \$130,000,000. An objection was made that this item, after all, was only about one-seventh of 1 percent of the total amount which

the Government was going to appropriate, and, therefore, why should we consider so small an item as that?

I know that in the pending bill the \$120,000,000 added by the committee may seem to be small in comparison with the \$80,000,000,000 which we are being asked to appropriate, but it is a small tributary stream, so to speak, of the great flood of inflation and of appropriations which faces us. But we can build retaining dams on the small streams as well as on the mighty rivers; and we have one of our chances here and now. If we do not take up these individual items and try to save on them as we go along, then the flood of appropriations will sweep into the main stream, the Government deficit will swell, the Government will be forced to borrow money from the banks, the banks will create more purchasing power, the price level will rise, and disaster will slowly set in, not only upon the middle class, but upon other elements in our society.

So, Mr. President, I think we would do well to examine this and other bills very carefully. I know it is always an ungracious thing to rise on the floor of the Senate to propose a reduction. In the first place, it seems to be egotistical, for the Senator making the suggestion to set his own judgment and knowledge above that of the devoted committee members, who have worked so long and so faithfully.

Mr. President, I hope that I shall not be regarded as speaking in that mood in any sense. I appreciate the work of the committee and the problem with which it was faced, but I also see the danger overhanging the country, and it seems to me that as Members of the Senate we have a responsibility to consider these items from which we cannot wholly divorce ourselves by confiding them to a committee, no matter how well intentioned it may be.

WE SHOULD CUT THE BUDGET BY AT LEAST \$5,000,000,000

I had hoped we could cut the civilian budget by \$2,000,000,000. At the rate we are going, I do not think we shall be able to achieve that figure. I have made a rough tabulation of the economies which the House and Senate have put into effect. Taking the deepest cuts, where no final agreement has been reached, the total savings to date look to be about a billion dollars. In my judgment, Mr. President, we must save at least \$5,000,000,000 out of the total budget, and we are falling well behind that figure. I have thought that, without reducing military effectiveness, if we could possibly squeeze \$2,000,000,000 out of the military budget and a billion dollars out of the foreign-aid budget, we would be nearer to the goal of a saving of \$5,000,000,000. Even with \$5,000,000,000 of savings—and we are not getting anywhere near that figure—if we are to prevent inflation, we shall have to pass a very rigorous tax bill. I think it was Burke who said, "To tax and to please is not given to mortal man." We may have to raise \$10,000,000,000 of revenue during the coming year if we are to prevent inflation.

WE MUST KEEP THE GENERAL PICTURE BEFORE US

So, Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate consider in the pending bill

not merely specific projects, however much they may appeal to us because they help our home communities or our home States, or however much we may feel impressed with the danger of flood from rushing waters. I hope we may realize the necessity of guarding against the danger of an inflationary flood. At an appropriate time I wish to offer amendments to the first title of the bill, the rivers and harbors title, which will save, if agreed to, approximately \$51,000,000.

Because of the fact that we were not able to get a copy of the bill and of the report until this morning, I have not been able to complete my analysis of the flood-control sections of the bill. The hasty inspection I have given leads me to the conclusion that I certainly shall not oppose the proposals for the new dams in Kansas. In view of what Kansas has gone through, even though another flood may not come for 100 years, I believe we should not ask Kansas to take a chance on that contingency. So I do not have the knife out for the Kansas projects.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Illinois, in his usual graphic way, has made a very interesting presentation. I appreciate the statement he has made in behalf of projects in the State of Kansas. Later on in the session I hope to discuss that section of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

There are included in the bill other projects, such as those on the Columbia River, which are possibly for flood control, but I suppose they are largely for power. It is true that the Columbia River and the St. Lawrence River are probably the two rivers which lend themselves mostly to power development, since they have a steady flow of water and a precipitous fall.

I also know that the Pacific Northwest is an area of great power shortage and that atomic energy work is done there. Nevertheless, in the case of these dams, it might perhaps be well if we should attach a provision that they shall be constructed only if certified by the United States Government for national defense, so that their construction would be dependent upon whether they were necessary in the national defense.

We may be able to find some appropriations among the flood-control items which will permit of economies being made, and I hope we shall.

MONEY FOR FURTHER PLANNING NOT NECESSARY

There is one further comment I should like to make, and that is with reference to appropriations for planning. The plans drawn by the Corps of Army Engineers, as I understand, are of two kinds. There are plans for projects authorized but for which appropriations have not yet been made, and there are plans for projects which have not yet been authorized. When I last totaled up the figures we had authorized for construction work under the Army engineers approximately \$5,300,000,000 worth of work in the future for which appropriations had not been made. Therefore the Army engineers would seem to have a pretty large backlog upon

which they can work without undertaking any scouting expeditions to dig up still further projects which they can add to the \$5,300,000,000. So I suggest that the planning provisions for items not authorized should be eliminated. From such study as I have been able to give to the bill, we would by this save approximately \$3,000,000.

PROJECTS CAN OFTEN BE DEFERRED

It has been said by the committee in its very able report that we cannot discontinue projects already started, or slow them up, because the contractor will have a claim against the Government. I have made some inquiry into that matter, and it is my understanding, subject to correction, that the General Accounting Office has held that no agency of the Government can make a binding contract for work for which appropriation has not been made, and that any agency which does make such a binding contract is acting ultra vires.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct with respect to the ultra vires character of the contract in behalf of the Government for the expenditure of money beyond that which has been appropriated or which has been authorized. The provision to which the Senator has referred need not be in the contract, however, because it is in the law, and the contract must be let in the light of the law.

However, the Government sustains losses independent of any claim for damages from a contractor in the case of a complete stoppage of a contract. The contractor also sustains losses thereby, but they are not compensable losses. When the contractor can no longer operate he can close his operation and move his facilities away and look for another chance to lose some more money.

The point is that when he does that the Government has the obligation of protecting the partially finished work. That in itself is no small chore, and represents a considerable sum of money. The Government has frequently purchased equipment on its own account. The equipment oftentimes is on the ground. Again the Government is responsible for protecting the idle material and equipment to which it holds title.

Then the other loss that the Government sustains—and I think it must necessarily flow from the situation—is that once the contractors are aware of the fact that a normal schedule of work on a given project is not to be followed, when they understand that the law is going to be operative, and that they can no longer hope that an adopted work schedule will be followed, then, of necessity, all bids will reflect those unstable conditions, and the bids will be higher, and they will have to be higher, because a contractor must protect himself against any loss he can foresee.

It is those three factors which represent a real loss when a construction program is slowed down or stopped.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. At

least the difficulty of slowing down the rate of construction is not so great as is sometimes assumed. The losses are indirect rather than direct, and they certainly would not apply in the case where we did not start new projects because there could be no loss there. I should think that some slowing down in the rate of construction in projects on which work was already under way could not really cause great losses to the Government.

Mr. President, these are thoughts I have wished to present for the consideration of the Senate.

I now send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated and, at the proper time, considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "\$213,932,613" and insert in lieu thereof "\$163,632,113."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table and explanations of how the amendment offered by me would affect various projects.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects reduced by Douglas amendment to rivers and harbors appropriation item in H. R. 4386

Project	Reductions—		Amount left
	Below Senate committee	Below budget	
Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama.....	\$4,000,000	\$4,500,000	-----
Jim Woodruff Dam, Fla.....	6,300,000	7,000,000	-----
Intracoastal Waterway, Fla.....	2,150,000	2,350,000	-----
Jacksonville Harbor, Fla.....	1,093,500	1,306,500	\$693,000
Buford Dam, Ga.....	900,000	900,000	-----
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City, Iowa.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	1,000,000
Calcasieu River and Pass, La.....	1,025,000	1,025,000	-----
Gulf Intracoastal waterway (Algiers Cut-off), La.....	4,300,000	4,800,000	100,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La.....	987,000	987,000	-----
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth.....	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,000,000
Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.....	305,000	305,000	-----
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----
Schuylkill River, Pa.....	1,900,000	1,900,000	-----
Cheatham Dam, Tenn.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	-----
Old Hickory lock and dam, Tennessee.....	6,000,000	8,000,000	-----
Houston ship channel, Texas.....	500,000	1,000,000	500,000
Plans.....	1,035,000	1,000,000	-----
Illinois waterway, Illinois.....	300,000	300,000	-----
St. Anthony's Falls, Minn.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	-----
Current expenses.....	9,705,000	9,835,000	60,000,000
Total cut.....	50,300,500	55,008,500	-----

DESCRIPTION OF RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS AFFECTED BY DOUGLAS AMENDMENT

Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama

Budget.....	\$4,500,000
House.....	4,000,000
Senate committee.....	4,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	0
Estimated total cost.....	21,000,000
Appropriated to date.....	3,500,000

It is reported that this project is one of the three locks and dams on the Inland waterway system most needing to be re-

placed. The other two are the Cheatham lock and dam on the Cumberland River and the Keokuk lock and dam on the upper Mississippi River. It is noteworthy that even though these three are said to be of high importance, the Corps of Engineers has not requested funds to replace the Keokuk lock and dam. Therefore, why go ahead on this project? The program contemplates initiating construction by continuing contract on the main structures during the current fiscal year. It would appear that at this time the project could be stopped with but small loss, although possibly a contract would need to be terminated. If the project is deferred, the estimate for 1952 can be reduced by the \$4,500,000 requested and probably some funds already allocated be saved.

This project, estimated to cost slightly less than \$21,000,000, was authorized in 1945. To date a little less than \$3,500,000 has been made available. The program for the current year, fiscal 1951, includes completion of plans and specifications, acquisition of land, completion of overburden excavation, completion of access-road construction, and completion of water-supply construction, each of which involves relatively small amounts of money. It is proposed to use \$1,750,000 this year to initiate the continuing contract for construction of the lock, dam, and appurtenances, estimated to cost \$15,750,000. The 1952 budget includes \$4,500,000 for continuing this same feature. The purpose of the construction is to replace four existing locks, called obsolete, with a single new higher-lift lock and dam. The proposed work will be a time saver but apparently will not actually increase the navigability of the waterway.

In short, this project would merely allow longer barge trains to move over an already existing waterway. It can easily be postponed.

Jim Woodruff Dam, Fla.

Budget	\$7,000,000
House	6,300,000
Senate committee	6,300,000
Douglas amendment	0
Estimated total cost	42,000,000
Appropriated to date	15,000,000

Scheduled date of completion of first power unit, December 1953, only 10,000 kilowatts. (This is only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the present capacity in Georgia, Florida, and Alabama.)

This is an illustration of a power project that in my judgment can be deferred. The budget calls for spending another \$7,000,000 on the Jim Woodruff Dam in Florida. The House and Senate committees have recommended \$6,300,000 for this item. Florida is not a mountainous country; power won't be available there for another 2½ years. Would it not perhaps be better to use the \$7,000,000 this year for weapons which we need right now? Seven million dollars would pay for two of the huge B-36 bombers, or 46 of the F-80 fighters. It would pay for 58 tanks or 57,000 bazookas or 115,000 rifles. This same amount of money would maintain 1,800 soldiers for a whole year. I think we should carry out these expenditures first, then maybe next year or the year thereafter we could continue the Jim Woodruff project.

Intracoastal waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Fla.,

Budget	\$2,350,000
House	2,150,000
Senate committee	2,150,000
Douglas amendment	0
Cost of present waterway	7,250,000
Proposed additional work	16,750,000
Appropriated to date	500,000
As of February 1951:	
Total spent	14,900
Total obligated	389,900
(Essentially a new start.)	

A channel 8 feet deep by 100 feet wide has been built between the cities of Jacksonville

and Miami, Fla., at a cost of approximately \$7,250,000. It is now proposed that at an additional cost of \$16,750,000 the channel be deepened to 12 feet and widened to 125 feet. Essentially none of the widening had been done prior to the current fiscal year. The sum of \$500,000 is available for fiscal year 1951 and \$2,350,000 is requested for fiscal year 1952, leaving a remainder of \$13,500,000 for subsequent years. The 12-foot channel in the waterway will constitute a continuation of the existing 12-foot intracoastal waterway along the south Atlantic coast. The agency states that the completion of the authorized project is essential to the economy of the entire eastern seaboard. The agency also points out that large benefits will accrue through the connection of the intracoastal waterway with the Canaveral Harbor Barge Canal, which is contemplated for 1953. It is to be noted that this latter barge canal will have an 8-foot depth and, notwithstanding any interest the Air Force may have in its use, a 12-foot channel in the main intracoastal waterway will not have any beneficial effect upon uses of the 8-foot channel. Traffic over the waterway decreased from a high in 1939 to a low in 1946. Traffic in 1948, the last year of published record, was about midway between the two; 436,000 tons. Cargo carried over the waterway consists largely of petroleum products and these constituted over half the traffic in 1948. The remainder moved over the waterway that year included 170,000 tons of seashells and as next in quantity some 16,000 tons of sand and gravel. Of the 35,000 motor vessels using the waterway, approximately 32,000 drew 4 feet or less; of the 2,200 barges, less than 10 percent drew over 6 feet.

The justifications for this project reads: "Considerable interest has been expressed by the Department of the Air Force relative to the completion of the inland waterway between the St. Johns River and Cocoa as a national defense measure to permit the movement of material and supplies by water to the Air Force proving ground at Cape Canaveral." Such materials could move over the existing 8-foot channel. In the absence of a real defense need it would appear that the project could readily be deferred with a reduction in appropriation of \$2,350,000.

This waterway would be convenient for moving vacationers' yachts and motor launches down to Miami.

Jacksonville Harbor, Fla.

Budget	\$2,000,000
House	693,500
Senate committee	1,787,000
Douglas amendment	693,000

House reduction of \$1,306,500 would leave funds for work in progress, including construction of a cut-off through three sharp and abrupt bends.

However, the House cut would postpone initiation of new work (entrance channel and ship channel dredging). This work can easily be postponed and the House figure should be adhered to.

The new improvement, apparently, is considered necessary to eliminate delays and difficulties of navigation. While Jacksonville harbor is an important terminus, the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for 1949 shows that of the 385 inbound steamers only 6 had drafts of over 30 feet, and only 76 vessels drew over 28 feet. Of the latter group all were steamers except two motor vessels.

Buford Dam, Ga.

Budget	\$900,000
House	0
Senate committee	900,000
Douglas amendment	0
Total cost	40,225,000
Total appropriated to date	2,300,000
As of February 1951:	
Total obligated	1,610,900
Total spent	1,221,000

Essentially a new start can be stopped.

Power not available until December 1955 (40,000 kilowatts) can be postponed as House has done.

This structure, one of four authorized in 1946 for construction as part of the improvement of the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint River system is estimated to cost \$40,225,000. Of the \$1,400,000 provided prior to 1951, approximately \$1,000,000 has been used on nonconstruction items. Construction of saddle dike No. 3 and excavation for the spillway will be completed with funds provided prior to 1951. The bulk of the \$900,000 available in 1951 and most of the \$900,000 requested for 1952 is earmarked for excavation work. Over \$37,000,000 is to be appropriated after fiscal year 1952. The present work schedule is based on placing power on the line in December 1955. The justification states the excavation must be completed before actual dam construction can be started. In addition to power from an initial installation of 40,000 kilowatts, the project is expected to provide water supply for a 9-foot navigation project, water supply for municipal and industrial purposes, flood control, and recreational benefits.

Illinois waterway, Illinois

Budget	\$300,000
House	0
Senate committee	300,000
Douglas amendment	0

Funds requested for 1952 total \$300,000 for additional dredging in the Starved Rock to Lockport reach. The work could probably be deferred, although the amount is not great and safety on this waterway may be relatively important.

Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa

Budget	\$4,000,000
House	4,000,000
Senate committee	4,000,000
Douglas amendment	1,000,000
Total estimated cost	172,000,000
Available so far	100,000,000

The funds are wanted primarily for dike and revetment construction. The agency justifies the request in part on the basis of having lost ground in the project through cessation of new work during World War II. Elsewhere in the estimates the sum of \$4,670,000 is requested for maintenance of the same project. It would appear that the work could again be shut down and maintenance funds should be adequate to prevent serious loss.

This is not flood control, the item for which comes under flood control. It is navigation.

Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana

Budget	\$1,025,000
House	775,000
Senate committee	1,025,000
Douglas amendment	0

A thirty-foot channel is available in this waterway although a 35-foot channel is authorized and is under construction. The funds requested would permit completion of the 35-foot channel in fiscal year 1952. Principal traffic is petroleum products. This channel has been developed since 1937 as an alternate to the Lake Charles deep-water channel which has deteriorated to a depth of approximately 20 feet. The portion of the channel already dredged to 35 feet, the full project depth, cannot be utilized unless the project is completed. However, the small number of ships using such depth does not indicate that the increase is urgently needed.

Gulf intracoastal waterway (Algiers cut-off), Louisiana

Budget	\$4,900,000
House	3,900,000
Senate committee	4,400,000
Douglas amendment	100,000

Of the \$4,900,000 requested, only \$100,000 is for continuation of work underway in 1951. The remainder is for new items of the project, all of which are reported to be necessary before the cut-off can be opened to traffic. Apparently \$4,800,000 of the amount requested could be deferred without physical damage to the work already in place. Justification for its being prosecuted at the present time is not clearly set forth in the presentation.

By stopping new work, this project can be reduced to \$100,000.

Pearl River, Miss. and La.

Budget.....	\$987,000
House.....	987,000
Senate committee.....	987,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

On the basis of the presentation it would appear that the full amount requested, \$987,000, could be deferred without physical damage to the work in place. It is stated that full benefits cannot be expected until the work is completed. It is not, however, clearly set forth that no benefits would materialize from the work already in place.

St. Anthony's Falls, Minneapolis, Minn.

Budget.....	\$1,500,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	1,500,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

This project consists of extending a channel upstream from the present head of navigation a distance of 4.6 miles. While the project will be only 18-percent complete at the end of fiscal year 1951, it is not clear from the presentation whether or not the work can be stopped without damage at this time or how many more years it will take to complete the work estimated to require \$15,000,000 after fiscal year 1952. The presentation does not make it clear that there is any real defense value or necessity of the project. It could be assumed, therefore, that the amount requested could be deferred.

My estimate of this situation has been backed up by the House.

Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth

Budget.....	\$2,300,000
House.....	2,300,000
Senate committee.....	2,300,000
Douglas amendment.....	1,000,000

This project is similar to Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City, except as to the amount of funds requested and the location. This request is for \$2,300,000 and elsewhere in these estimates the amount of \$2,852,000 is requested for maintenance. It would appear that this new work, similar to that proposed for the upper Missouri could be deferred.

Appropriation recommended includes under "Current expenses" \$4,670,000 and \$2,852,000 for these two projects for maintenance. It would appear that much of the new work, at least, could be deferred. New work and maintenance are essentially of same type—jetties, revetment, and dredging. This is navigation not flood control.

Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.

Budget.....	\$305,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	305,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

The funds requested, \$305,000, would provide for deepening the harbor. The project is requested on the basis of safety and ease of navigation. Since it provides only an alternate entrance to the harbor it can be deferred.

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio

Budget.....	\$1,000,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	1,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

Funds requested of \$1,000,000 consist of \$75,000 for improvement of channels and \$925,000 for replacement of a bridge. It is not clear why replacement of the bridge is essential at this time. Therefore, judgement of House of Representatives should be followed.

Schuylkill River, Pa.

Budget.....	\$1,900,000
House.....	1,000,000
Senate committee.....	1,900,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

This project authorized in 1946 is estimated to cost slightly more than 12½ million. Through 1950, \$400,000 was made available primarily for the preparation of disposal areas. No funds were made available for fiscal year 1951. The 1952 program of \$1,900,000 contemplates further work on disposal areas, the initiation of dredging of one pool and the initiation and completion of dredging of a second of the three pools into which the river is divided for the purposes of the project. The project is to remove from the river the great masses of culm, which have gathered through the years as waste products from the coal mines. A justification for Federal participation is that ultimately the culm will move into Philadelphia Harbor and be removed by the Federal Government as maintenance at a greater cost than it can be removed by action where the waste now lays. Since no work on culm removal has started the project can be considered a new project.

Cheatham Dam, Tenn.

Budget.....	\$3,000,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	3,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	0
Total cost.....	14,000,000
Appropriated to date.....	4,000,000

This project on the Cumberland River is considered necessary to relieve a bottleneck in navigation. While over \$10,000,000 of the \$14,000,000 total cost is yet to be appropriated, it is not clear from the justifications the extent to which the additional \$3,000,000 must be made available at this time.

This project is similar to the Demopolis lock and dam project. There is no reason for allowing it to progress while doing nothing about the Keokuk project which is claimed to be equally important.

The House knocked it out and we should stand by this decision.

Old Hickory lock and dam, Tennessee

Budget.....	\$8,000,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	6,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

This project, estimated to cost \$49,120,000, has not yet been started. The sum of \$8,000,000 is requested to initiate construction. This dam would be on the Cumberland River, and provide both power and navigation improvement. The first unit of power, 25,000 kilowatts, would be placed on the line in December 1953. The fourth unit in the same amount would be ready in September 1954 under the schedule presented. This is one of the seven new power projects proposed by the budget.

The House report (p. 3) states:

"The amount of \$8,000,000 requested for beginning construction on the Old Hickory lock and dam, Tenn., is denied. The data submitted to the Congress in justification of this project failed to show that (1) navigation benefits, without construction of other dams, are significant, (2) power needs are urgent, or (3) the project has been adequately planned for construction."

Houston ship channel, Texas

Budget.....	\$1,500,000
House.....	500,000
Senate committee.....	1,000,000
Douglas amendment.....	500,000

The funds requested, \$1,500,000, would provide for completing one reach of channel being started with funds available during the current year and for the initiation and completion of a second reach. The reach to be completed extends to an ordnance depot slip.

The immediate need of deepening the existing channel to 36 feet in the reach to be started and completed in fiscal year 1952 is not obvious from the presentation. It may be that this item could be eliminated for the time being without serious inconvenience or loss. On the other hand, in view of the great industrial growth of the whole Houston area the project may be worthy of continuation at this time as a part of the preparedness program. Since the last annual report for 1949 shows only two out-bound steamers as having drafts of 34 feet and only one in-bound vessel with a draft as much as 32 feet, it would appear that doubt might be resolved in favor of deferral.

Preparation of plans

Budget.....	\$1,000,000
House.....	0
Senate committee.....	1,035,000
Douglas amendment.....	0

The Department requests \$1,000,000 for further preparation of plans on nine projects which are estimated to cost a total of over \$1,300,000,000. The amount requested can be eliminated without disrupting any construction, since the projects involved have not yet been started. On the other hand, it would seem sound that some planning go forward at this time so that projects found to be worth while can be undertaken in the future at such time as deemed proper without conflict with the defense program.

Current expense

Budget.....	\$69,835,000
House.....	65,000,000
Senate committee.....	69,705,000
Douglas amendment.....	60,000,000

The budget includes a request totaling \$69,835,000 for funds in the category of current expenses. This includes \$62,670,000 for routine operation and maintenance, \$800,000 for removing sunken vessels and straightening channels, \$1,650,000 for surveys and studies, \$1,685,000 for miscellaneous inspections, investigations, and enforcement of regulations, \$1,170,000 for salaries in Washington, and \$1,860,000 for transfers to other agencies of the Federal Government for work on behalf of the Corps of Engineers program. On the basis of past experience it can be expected that the amount requested would provide ample operations. However, the presentation gives no basis for any deviation from the amount requested. It would appear that any reduction made would have to be based on a rule of thumb percentage reduction, recognizing that some maintenance might then need to be deferred and some of the less worthy projects carried forward in a less completely maintained status.

Uneconomic projects can be abandoned. This was done in the case of the Hennepin Canal in Illinois, and it can be done in other places.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for the splendid way in which he has presented a problem that concerns all of us. I trust that as we continue the present debate we will hear statements of those having varying views on the present situation and the problems resulting from it.

At this time I again wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and members of

the committee, for the courtesies they extended citizens of the flood areas of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma by granting them a generous amount of time to present their problems to the committee.

Second, I wish to commend the Civil Functions Subcommittee and the members of the full Appropriations Committee for heeding the pleas of our citizens and recommending appropriations to the Senate for the commencement of some of the projects under the Pick-Sloan plan.

Third, I wish to commend Gen. Lewis A. Pick and his staff in Washington and the division and district offices in Omaha and Kansas City, first for the personal interest they have taken in the disastrous floods in the devastated area. This was mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee, who stated that General Pick did not send someone into the area to study the floods, but went there himself. Second, I wish to commend them for the prompt way in which they presented a request for supplemental appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget.

We are fortunate, in my opinion, to have General Pick as the Chief of Engineers at this time. He is thoroughly familiar with the problems of the Missouri River Basin. He is coauthor of the Pick-Sloan plan.

Fourth, I wish to commend Michael Straus, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the members of his staff for the prompt manner in which they sent their representative into the tributary watersheds to evaluate the damage caused by the recent floods. It is my hope that they will soon have recommendations to present to Congress on proposed reclamation projects in these flooded areas. These recommendations will be based upon information secured as the result of the greater volumes of water that have flowed through these tributary streams in the recent floods.

Recently, I wrote Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of Interior, and urged that he make a request to the Bureau of the Budget for supplemental appropriations to commence some of the reservoir projects on the Solomon and Saline Rivers.

The most destructive floods in the history of the United States occurred during the months of June and July of this year. It is estimated that the total flood damage in the States of Kansas and Oklahoma is in excess of \$1,000,000,000.

The devastation and destruction done by these floods, through the loss of life and the loss of property, stands as a monument to our failure to provide flood control on these streams.

During my service in the House of Representatives in 1938, at which time I was a member of the House Flood Control Committee, we prepared, and Congress adopted, a general, comprehensive plan for flood control and for other purposes in the Missouri River Basin. This recommendation on the part of our committee was approved by Congress on June 28, 1938.

Fortunately we do have a comprehensive plan for flood control, soil conservation, power, recreation, and storage of water for beneficial uses. It is the Pick-Sloan plan.

Mr. President, I was pleased that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] discussed this all-inclusive program. It is a comprehensive program, and I am not one of those who believe that one phase of the work is all we need to complete in order to control the floods on the major streams and the tributary streams.

Unfortunately, many of the opponents of the Pick-Sloan plan call it a big-dam plan. The truth is that it is an all-inclusive program, and if carried out in full as approved by Congress, it would control water runoff at its source through terracing, soil-conservation practices, and detention dams on the tributary streams. In addition, it provides for large reservoirs for impounding a large volume of water.

The agricultural phase of the Pick-Sloan plan was submitted to Congress in House Document 373, Eighty-first Congress, second session, and is now in the Committee on Agriculture.

During the hearings before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I appeared personally and urged the inclusion of funds for the control of tributary watersheds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations be made a part of the record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARLSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity of appearing before your committee and urging sufficient appropriations for a program of soil conservation and the source control of water runoff.

During my service in the House of Representatives, I had the opportunity of helping write legislation for a coordinated program of river-basin development with multiple-purpose objectives.

This program especially emphasized the conservation of the productive-land resources of a basin, and in addition to checking erosion, dealt with the problem of control of water runoff at its source.

It is my contention that there is a great urgency that we intensify action on this program of erosion control and conservation work on the basis of distinct watersheds. I stress this program and development for the reasons that—

1. It is important that we intensify our efforts to save topsoil;
 2. Every effort should be made to control the flow of water at its source;
 3. This program would have a direct bearing on the amount of floodwaters that cause devastation in the valleys; and
 4. It would reduce the rate of siltation in reservoirs that are already constructed, or being considered in the Missouri River Basin.
- Kansas and many States in the Midwest have suffered seriously from floods this year. In many instances there have been flash floods on small tributary watersheds which proved as disastrous to the very headwaters of small streams as to our large rivers.

The Soil Conservation Service has a number of demonstration projects which deal with entire watersheds. These projects have demonstrated their value by protecting the land with terraces, erosion control, dams, and other conservation measures which came through the storms with comparatively light damage.

It is my contention that these types of programs should have the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers for a coordinated flood-control program for the entire watersheds.

I realize that this job presents a program of water conservation and flood control that requires special authorization for the Department of Agriculture. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will have an opportunity to authorize the recommendations as printed in House Document No. 373, Eighty-first Congress, first session, and now in the Committee on Agriculture.

It is also my hope that a coordinated soil control and water runoff program may be carried on through the regular Soil Conservation Service on a watershed basis.

I would urge this committee to authorize sufficient funds that we might have at least two projects started in the State of Kansas on a complete watershed basis.

These projects would serve as pilot projects for demonstration purposes.

There is much interest in this program in our State, and therefore, I urge that the committee give serious consideration to this request.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this comprehensive plan for flood control, water runoff, and soil erosion was developed after years of study. Thousands of dollars were spent and volumes of data were gathered. The best engineering talent of the world was consulted and they put in concrete form the proposal which would place in operation structures which would forever remove the fear of flood. These plans are specific for each river basin.

As I stated previously, a comprehensive and all-inclusive program has developed or is developing basic plans for the reduction of water runoff and erosion control through the Soil Conservation Service. These plans are a concurrent work, vitally necessary in order to protect tributary watersheds, reduce land loss, preserve our soils, and prevent silting of reservoirs.

There is no difference of opinion between the various governmental agencies on the effectiveness of this coordinated program. With reservoirs and the soil-conservation program floods can be stopped.

Mr. President, one of the difficulties and one of the serious problems in constructing a reservoir is the hardships resulting from the dislocations of the owners of the property in the reservoir area.

It is regrettable that a large number of farmers and citizens will be required to give up their land and homes in the reservoir area. A dam and reservoir must naturally be located in the fertile valleys of our State where we have some of our richest and best soils.

Many of these farms have been in the family for decades and sometimes for generations. Under these circumstances, it means more than just farm lands and buildings—it means that a home has been established which has been an important part of the economic

and community life of that section and of the State.

Generally speaking, these farms in the river valleys which will be flooded comprise farm units which have as a part of their balanced agricultural operation grass lands, which fit into the over-all farm picture. When the bottom land is removed from the farm unit which has furnished the feed and forage for livestock grazed on the grass lands, the value of the farm is destroyed. More than that, in most instances there is great sentiment attached to these homes. It is the social unit that established and maintained the church, the school, and the home which is so vital in the life of any community or nation.

I can state very definitely that the dislocation of the homes and the destruction of these farms distress me greatly. We regret the loss of the production of these farms. But everyone must agree we cannot permit a recurrence of the past floods if it can be prevented.

We must view the project, its benefits and effect on the entire economic picture of the State on a long-time basis.

I have discussed the matter of land acquisition for proposed reservoirs in Kansas with the Chief Engineers' office. The Corps of Army Engineers has a real-estate division within its own organization for the acquisition of lands needed for dam sites, rights-of-way and easements. The personnel of the real-estate division in the various division offices has had much experience in dealing with this problem and has been advised by the authorities in charge to keep in mind not only the actual loss sustained by these people, but also the problem that will be confronting them in securing a new location.

I am urging that more consideration be given the farmers who are to be displaced in the reservoir area. For instance, if there is a railroad, a highway, a city, a cemetery or a public utility within the boundaries of the proposed dam site and reservoir, the government will reestablish the facility in as good or better condition than it was in the old site. It seems to me that the farmer should be entitled to the same consideration.

I am going to make one suggestion. I do not know how practical it will be, but it seems to me to be worthy of consideration. I suggest that when funds have been voted for the commencement of a reservoir and work is actually under way, the Government pay the farmers for their land at the earliest possible date, and that the farmer be given an opportunity to live on his place and receive the benefits from it until the construction is complete.

Under existing law, great acreages of the flood area in a reservoir are leased annually by the Corps of Army Engineers. The farmer who owned the farm previous to the Government's taking it over is given the first opportunity to lease this land if he so desires.

It seems to me that it is only reasonable to insist that the Government deal fairly and most generously with these citizens. Not only that, I believe that the Government should, so far as possible, relocate the farmer on a site approxi-

mately equal to that which he is giving up.

If some such provision could be written into law or carried out by existing authorities, it would do much to alleviate one of the difficult problems in constructing a reservoir.

Great economic benefits can and will come to the basin on the completion of this program.

During the past few weeks I have received some letters urging me to oppose the expenditures of moneys for flood control. Now everyone realizes that in a period of national emergency when there is great need for national defense money, we must economize; but I would be untrue to my trust if I voted to economize on our own citizens and yet the Congress voted millions of dollars for flood-control and reclamation programs in many foreign countries.

Let us keep the record straight. I am for taking care of our own citizens first. Had we spent \$300,000,000 in the State of Kansas for flood control, we would not have had the \$1,000,000,000 loss. That expenditure to me would not only be sound, but would be a prudent investment for the future.

I think I should mention that during the past few years Congress has voted money for the exact duplicate type of flood-control programs for reservoirs and reclamation projects in foreign countries. Many of these are on a much larger scale than proposed for our State.

The records show that we have been spending hundreds of millions of dollars for this type of program in French Indochina, Thailand, Italy, France, Greece, French Morocco, Dutch Guiana, British Guiana, and Jamaica. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Tennessee mentioned the fact that we are about to carry on a great survey and study in Burma.

If we are to continue to assist our foreign friends and neighbors, we must make provision to protect and preserve our own economy. We cannot afford the continued loss and destruction of our soil, our homes, and our factories.

During this debate no doubt someone is going to come up with the old familiar slogan "A Vote for Flood Control Is a Pork Barrel Vote."

During my service in the House of Representatives the words "pork barrel" were the rallying cry for those who would oppose these expenditures. The answer, of course, is that we have constructed a large number of flood-control projects in the United States and they have been and are paying big dividends.

I invite those who are going to shout about "pork barrel" expenditures to visit the devastated flood areas in Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. They should see the desolate empty spaces where once stood the homes of thousands of our citizens with all their worldly possessions. They should see the destruction that was wrought to the railroads, the highways, and the utilities in that area. They should see the destruction that was wrought in the great industrial centers of those cities.

So far as I am concerned, the odium that might be attached to the words

"pork barrel" is not going to deter me from working for and voting for a program that will protect our citizens from another disastrous flood.

Our first problem, of course, is to take care of the needy and those who lost their all in the flood. They must be rehabilitated, the farms must be returned to normal production, the factories must be reopened.

Our second problem is to reconstruct and rebuild the levees that were damaged and destroyed and then construct reservoirs that will impound a large volume of this water.

Had these reservoirs been constructed in the recent flood the crest would have been several feet lower and the damage materially reduced.

With one-third of the money lost in this flood, the river basins in Kansas would have had protection for decades to come.

Mr. President, on July 21, following the disastrous flood in Kansas, Senator Arthur Capper, a former colleague and Member of this body for many years, wrote a fine editorial known as Farmer Support for Basic Pick-Sloan Plan.

I can state very definitely and very honestly that no one in Kansas has been more devoted to the interests of the people of our State than our former distinguished Senator Arthur Capper. In this editorial he not only discusses the great damage done to our citizens in the Kansas River Valley but over the entire State and states that it is with reluctance that he endorses and approves a program that will dislocate many farm families.

I want to assure you, Mr. President, that I share his views on this very difficult problem.

In reaching his conclusion to endorse the Pick-Sloan plan and urging appropriations for the early commencement of projects as proposed in that plan, he states:

I will hold firmly to the opinion that in the long run the true interest of the land and the people on the land, and in the cities, will be best served by impounding surplus waters nearest the points where the rain falls.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPPER ASKS FARMER SUPPORT FOR BASIC PICK-SLOAN PLAN

As I see it, the difference between a 32-foot flood stage on the Kaw at Topeka, and a 37-foot stage, is the difference between dikes for protection on the one hand; and on the other hand, dams and reservoirs such as Tuttle Creek on the Blue, Milford on the Republican, and other dams and reservoirs to hold back the disastrous floodwaters until the danger stage has passed.

I am using the Kaw Valley simply as an example. The same holds true for other river valleys in Kansas that have overflowed, causing perhaps close to a billion dollars damage to industry and agriculture and householders in the past few weeks.

FOR PICK-SLOAN PLAN

Faced with the probable alternative of a Missouri Valley Authority, my advice to the farmers of Kansas today is to go along with the basic provisions of the Pick-Sloan plan. It is highly preferable, in my judgment, to that alternative, the creation of a Missouri

Valley Authority that would give Washington life and death powers over agriculture, business, industry, and labor in the entire area.

I have come to this decision with reluctance. The idea of putting 500 farmers off their land in the fertile valley of the Blue River above Manhattan is most repugnant to me. The loss of production of these fertile acres also is most regrettable. But the devastation wrought by the recent floods cannot be permitted to happen again, if humanly possible to prevent.

VIEW ON DAMS

If I could have my way, these big dams and reservoirs would be constructed for flood control, but not coupled up with grandiose schemes for recreation, navigation, irrigation, and federally controlled electric power projects.

But the plans that have been drawn in the past few years all seem to call for multiple-purpose reservoirs. Federal funds can be obtained only for multiple-purpose dams and reservoirs. Without Federal funds, it is extremely doubtful if adequate flood control projects will be constructed.

I will hold firmly to the opinion that in the long run the true interest of the land and the people on the land, and in the cities,

will be best served by impounding surplus waters nearest the points where the rain falls.

CONSERVATION STILL NEEDED

Approved land and water conservation practices, contour farming and terracing; farm ponds and numerous reservoirs of smaller type than the mammoth Tuttle Creeks and Milfords and such, still will be necessary. These will be necessary not only to conserve the soil for production purposes, but also to stave off as long as possible the accumulation of silt in the large-type reservoirs.

My heart goes out in sympathy to those whose homes have been devastated by these catastrophic floods of 1951. The task of restoring these homes to make them livable; the slime, the mud, the stench; the back-breaking, discouraging work of getting the job done in the distressful humid heat of July and August in these river valley homes, towns, and cities—these try the souls of men and women almost beyond endurance, it will seem.

PEOPLE WILL MEET TEST

But I know the people of Kansas, on the farms, in the towns, in the cities, in the homes. In my 86 years I have known them, their fathers and mothers, their grandfathers and grandmothers. Through three gen-

erations I have watched them meet and conquer adversity with high courage and dogged determination.

The motto of the State of Kansas, "To the stars through difficulties," has been tested and proved through the better part of the century since white men first came to settle in the Flint Hills and on the prairies.

We will take this 1951 flood and its ravages in our stride, and do the things necessary to prevent the wholesale devastation and suffering happening again. Another like it may not come again in a half century—but there is no assurance that it might not come again next year, or any year thereafter.

So we must prepare for the worst—and prepare also to make the best of it, whatever happens.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Corps of Army Engineers has submitted a list of the authorized and unauthorized proposed reservoir projects on the Kansas River watersheds, and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS RIVER BASIN

Project	Stream	Storage (acre-feet)				Estimated cost	Appropriate to date
		Flood control	Irrigation	Conservation	Total		
AUTHORIZED							
Corps of Engineers:							
Harlan County Reservoir.....	Republican.....	500,000	150,000	200,000	850,000	\$49,897,000	\$46,132,400
Red Willow Reservoir.....	Red, Willow Creek.....	22,000	15,500	11,000	48,500	10,017,000	0
Pioneer Reservoir.....	Arikaree.....	73,000	10,000	26,000	109,000	15,700,000	181,000
Kanopolis Reservoir.....	Smoky Hill.....	213,000	187,000	50,000	450,000	12,167,000	12,167,000
Tuttle Creek Reservoir.....	Big Blue.....	1,600,000	495,000	185,000	2,280,000	71,573,000	213,100
Bureau of Reclamation:							
Cedar Bluff Reservoir.....	Smoky Hill.....	230,000	68,600	53,600	352,200	20,311,000	15,500,000
Kirwin Reservoir.....	North Fork, Solomon.....	105,000	80,000	15,000	200,000	18,155,000	455,000
Trenton Reservoir.....	Republican.....	95,000	45,000	30,000	170,000	24,165,000	19,887,500
Medicine Creek Reservoir.....	Medicine Creek.....	53,000	25,000	15,000	93,000	7,157,000	7,000,000
Norton (Almena) Reservoir.....	Prairie Dog Creek.....		10,000	6,000	16,000	11,100,000	0
Enders Reservoir.....	Frenchman Creek.....	30,000	34,000	10,000	74,000	8,409,000	8,000,000
Wray Reservoir, Colo.....	North Fork, Arikaree.....		7,500	500	8,000	2,410,000	47,200
Bonny Reservoir, Colo.....	Republican.....	132,000	35,000	15,000	182,000	15,156,000	13,839,000
Glen Elder Reservoir.....	Solomon.....	183,000	171,100	25,000	379,100	24,273,000	0
Webster Reservoir.....	South Fork, Solomon.....	94,000	150,000	11,000	255,000	14,881,000	0
Wilson Reservoir.....	Saline River.....	145,000	224,900	19,000	388,900	14,869,000	0
RECOMMENDED							
(H. Doc. 642, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)							
Corps of Engineers:							
Milford Reservoir.....	Republican.....	700,000		40,000	740,000	26,143,000	0
Perry Reservoir.....	Delaware River.....	187,000	147,000	26,000	360,000	11,697,000	0

VERDIGRIS RIVER BASIN

AUTHORIZED							
Corps of Engineers:							
Fall River Reservoir.....	Fall River.....	236,000	-----	27,000	263,000	\$10,722,500	\$10,722,500
Toronto Reservoir.....	Verdigris River.....	171,000	-----	24,000	195,000	15,000,000	260,000
Elk City Reservoir.....	Elk River.....	263,000	-----	26,000	289,000	21,030,000	115,000
Neodesha Reservoir.....	Verdigris River.....	80,000	-----	10,000	90,000	14,330,000	125,000

GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN

AUTHORIZED							
Corps of Engineers:							
Council Grove Reservoir.....	Neosho River.....	60,000	-----	25,000	85,000	8,240,000	0
Marion Reservoir.....	Cottonwood River.....	60,000	-----	30,000	90,000	6,650,000	0
Cedar Point Reservoir.....	Cedar Creek.....	36,200	-----	18,800	55,000	5,285,000	0
Strawn Reservoir.....	Neosho River.....	322,000	-----	52,000	374,000	18,445,000	0

OSAGE RIVER BASIN

RECOMMENDED							
(H. Doc. 549, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)							
Corps of Engineers:							
Pomona Reservoir.....	110 Mile Creek.....	155,000	-----	26,000	181,000	\$9,076,000	0
Melvorn Reservoir.....	Marais des Cygnes River.....	170,000	-----	28,000	198,000	13,000,000	0
Garnett Reservoir.....	Pottawatomie Creek.....	160,000	-----	26,000	186,000	9,865,000	0
Hillsdale Reservoir.....	Big Bull Creek.....	77,000	-----	13,000	90,000	5,924,000	0
Fort Scott Reservoir.....	Marmaton River.....	130,750	-----	6,250	137,000	10,674,000	0

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the American National Red Cross furnished me statistics on the estimated property damage and Red Cross caseload as of July 25, 1951. These figures were secured from counties that suffered disastrous flood losses.

41,780 families were affected; 1,572 homes were completely destroyed; 5,350

homes suffered major damage; and 13,715 suffered minor damage.

The 1,572 homes were completely destroyed. They were not there any more. It was my privilege to visit some of these areas, and I saw beautiful residential sections completely washed away.

Of course, the statistics do not tell the

story of mental and physical agony that the citizens suffered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American National Red Cross—Statistics on estimated property damage and Red Cross case load. Where no figures appear information is lacking as of July 25, 1951

County and headquarters or chapter	Number of families affected	Number of homes destroyed	Number of homes damaged		Registrations estimated		County and headquarters or chapter	Number of families affected	Number of homes destroyed	Number of homes damaged		Registrations estimated	
			Major	Minor	To date	Total registra- tions				Major	Minor	To date	Total registra- tions
Kansas:							Kansas—Continued						
Wyandotte County, Kansas City	12,500	850	650	1,780	6,500	7,000	Morris County, Coun- cil Grove	500	2	15	300	66	75
Douglas County, Lawrence	1,100	60	225	220	500	650	Wabunsee County, Paxico	180	10	55	115	49	70
Shawnee County, To- peka	7,600	300	1,500	2,500	2,750	3,200	Leavenworth County, Leavenworth	125	7	30	78	25	35
Franklin County, Ot- tawa	1,000	45	150	350	430	500	Jefferson County, Perry	361	5	50	300	100	175
Riley County, Man- hattan	2,251	79	476	883	410	500	Pottawatomie Coun- ty, Wamego	250	10	100	140	0	50
Geary County, Junc- tion City	600	50	100	180	203	250	Cloud County, Con- cordia	100	0	15	80	24	30
Saline County, Salina	5,700	0	115	2,768	537	1,000	Ottawa County, Tes- cott	750	0	20	650	28	50
LaBette County, Par- sons	505	5	200	300	43	105	Mitchell County, Beliot	375	0	50	250	25	50
Neosho County, Cha- nute	510	20	25	434	180	250	Lincoln County, Ber- nard	120	0	15	100	11	35
Allen County, Iola	1,215	35	910	167	361	475	Barton County, Great Bend	150	0	0	10	0	0
Woodson County, Yates Center	158	8	82	68	119	140	Johnson County, Olathe	100	27	31	8	64	80
Coffey County, Burl- ington	285	15	15	254	61	70	Total	41,780	1,572	5,350	13,715	13,282	15,970
Miami County, Paola	1,000	30	200	500	149	200	Oklahoma:						
Lyon County, Empo- ria	200	0	1	50	21	55	Miami County, Ot- tawa	1,700	50	350	1,300	413	1,300
Chase County, Cot- tonwood Falls	700	10	45	90	147	230	Nowata County, Nowata	60	0	20	60	15	15
Marion County, Mar- ion	1,500	5	40	610	380	475							
Dickinson County, Herrington	45	0	0	30	17	20							
Dickinson County, Abilene	1,900	0	100	500	82	200							

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. Emmett Womer, chairman of the State Agriculture Mobilization Committee, has furnished me with statistics showing the flood loss to crops in Kansas in 82 of the State's 105 counties to be \$54,454,000. According to the information he submitted, the total flood damage to crops, buildings, and equipment was \$76,338,477. The survey shows more than 20,000 of the State's 137,000 farms were damaged directly by flooding. More than 2,866,000 acres were inundated, of which 2,268,000 were in crops. Ravines, ditches, or gullies were hollowed out by the floods on some 565,000 acres.

Completely destroyed were 244 farm dwellings and 3,724 more were badly damaged, for a loss of \$5,841,000.

The floods took 455 barns with them and left 3,564 badly damaged for a loss of \$2,308,000. Other farm buildings destroyed totaled 4,296 and an additional 8,603 were badly damaged. The loss here was \$3,495,000.

Total farm machinery lost totaled \$2,527,000. This included the loss of 84 tractors, 176 cars and trucks, and 178 other pieces of farm machinery. Badly damaged were 1,564 tractors, 1,609 cars and trucks, and 2,049 other machines.

Easy prey to floodwaters, farm fencing destroyed totaled 10,000 miles, and badly damaged fencing added another 12,000 miles, for a total cost of three and a half million dollars.

Livestock loss was not so heavy. It totaled \$829,793, which included the loss of 1,500 cattle, 1,033 sheep, 7,962 hogs, and 256,000 poultry.

Flood loans will be sought by more than 4,000 farmers, Mr. Womer said.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the statistics furnished me by Mr. Womer.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE ESTIMATE OF DAMAGE FROM FLOOD, WET WEATHER, WIND, AND HAIL, JULY 25, 1951

Section I. Flood area. (If you have no flood area in your county, fill out report p. 4 only.)

A. Farm and acreage information:

1. Number of farms in this county..... 137,521
2. Number of farms directly damaged by flood..... 20,248
3. What was the approximate acreage damaged by flood?
 - (a) Cropland, 2,268,415 acres; noncropland, 618,940 acres; total, 2,886,275 acres.
 - (b) Of the above total how many acres were physically damaged by floodwater (cutting, excessive silt or sand deposits, debris, etc.), 565,819 acres.

B. How many buildings, fences, machines, and equipment were destroyed or badly damaged?

	Destroyed (number)	Badly damaged (number)	Estimated damage in dollars
1. Farm buildings destroyed or badly damaged.			
(a) Dwellings.....	244	3,724	5,841,050
(b) Barns.....	455	3,564	2,308,200
(c) Grain storage buildings and bins.....	964	2,888	1,207,700
(d) Other buildings.....	3,332	5,715	2,287,675
2. Farm machinery:			
(a) Tractors.....	84	1,564	627,600
(b) Cars and trucks.....	176	1,609	786,600
(c) Combines, hay balers, and corn pickers.....	178	2,400	1,002,970
3. Major electrical equipment on farms:			
(a) Farm (including feed grinders, milking machines, large motors, milk coolers, etc.).....	429	2,260	170,744
(b) Home (including refrigerators, stoves, deep freezers, etc.).....	827	3,645	652,765
4. Fences (report in miles).....	10,014	11,995	3,494,965
Total estimated damage (add B1, 2, 3, 4).....			18,380,26

C. How many acres of crops were originally planted, completely lost, or damaged in flooded areas?

	Acres planted	Acres completely lost—		Acres damaged but will probably be harvested	Estimated loss in dollars
		Prior to June 1	After June 1		
Wheat.....	1,007,426	74,716	515,810	308,556	19,705,574
Oats.....	157,275	13,578	77,586	30,310	2,167,319
Corn.....	537,046	8,566	328,622	154,038	16,343,166
Soybeans.....	84,107	140	59,048	17,325	2,681,641
Sorghum.....	165,322	3,282	84,237	36,559	3,789,810
Alfalfa.....		10,995	113,354	55,599	6,391,326
All other crops ¹	173,057	3,174	92,915	28,527	3,375,250
Total value of all crops lost.....					54,454,086

¹ List on back information for such crops as bromegrass seed, sweetclover seed, potatoes, etc.

D. How many livestock and poultry were lost in flooded areas?

	Number	Estimated loss
Cattle less Wyandotte County.....	1,549	\$321,250
Sheep less Wyandotte County.....	1,499	311,250
Hogs less Wyandotte County.....	13,033	49,150
Poultry less Wyandotte County.....	1,033	28,750
	13,962	408,613
	7,962	228,613
	271,000	276,180
	256,000	261,180
Total value of all livestock loss less Wyandotte County.....		1,055,193
		829,793

E. How much stored grain and roughage was lost in flooded areas?

	Amount lost	Estimated loss
Wheat, bushels.....	139,020	\$277,840
Corn, bushels.....	358,280	552,423
Other grains, bushels.....	155,407	246,807
All hay, tons.....	102,481	1,597,259
Total value of stored grain and roughage lost.....		2,674,329

F. Total of estimated loss on farms in flooded areas (add B, C, D, and E), \$76,338,477.

H. How much emergency assistance will be needed in flooded areas?

1. Feed supplies not available locally but will be needed before Sept. 1, 1951:
- (a) Grains, bushels..... 209,700
- (b) Hay, tons..... 1,000
- (c) Protein concentrates, tons..... 3,975

	Acres planted	Acres completely lost—		Acres damaged but will probably be harvested	Estimated loss in dollars
		Prior to June 1	After June 1		
Wheat.....	12,944,041	2,875,918	1,549,837	5,871,579	107,685,278
Oats.....	1,048,090	91,565	264,583	611,667	10,368,221
Corn.....	2,143,899	6,400	262,228	1,058,333	11,199,544
Soybeans.....	350,315	350	57,603	217,957	3,441,773
Sorghum.....	3,679,083	33,208	822,312	1,305,208	15,857,085
Alfalfa.....		22,600	104,410	382,964	7,314,620
All other crops ¹	576,533	36,200	86,275	262,475	5,358,226
Total value of all crops lost.....					192,405,779

C. How much emergency assistance will be needed on farms not in the flood area?

1. Feed supplies not available locally that will be needed before Sept. 1, 1951:
- (a) Grains, bushels..... 208,500
- (b) Hay, tons..... 2,692
- (c) Protein concentrates, tons..... 2,692
2. How many farms will need disaster loans for crop production? Number, 5,008. Estimated amount, \$3,692,200.
3. Other needs.....

2. About how many farmers will need disaster loans? 4,021.

Of this number how many loans will be for:

	Number	Estimated amount
(a) Crop production.....	3,055	\$2,860,700
(b) Livestock and equipment.....	1,381	1,907,000
(c) Buildings and fence repair.....	1,511	2,937,500

3. Other needs: \$545,400.

4. Restoration of established conservation practices:

	Amount	Estimated cost of repairs
(a) Terraces, miles damaged.....	251	14,968
(b) Stock water ponds, number damaged.....	72	10,325
(c) Diversion terraces, number damaged.....	279	21,315
(d) Terrace outlets, acres damaged.....	634	44,695
(e) Erosion control dams, number damaged.....	120	8,625

I. List damage to nonfarm businesses and facilities serving farmers principally such as grain elevators, transportation facilities, seed and fertilizer dealers, and packing plants. (List on separate sheet if necessary.)

Section II. Nonflood area report:

A. Farm information:

1. Number of farms not in flood area..... 115,541
2. Number of such farms damaged by excessive rain, hail, or wind..... 100,965
- B. How many acres of crops on these farms were originally planted, completely lost or damaged by rain, hail, or wind?

	Acres planted	Acres completely lost—		Acres damaged but will probably be harvested	Estimated loss in dollars
		Prior to June 1	After June 1		
Wheat.....	12,944,041	2,875,918	1,549,837	5,871,579	107,685,278
Oats.....	1,048,090	91,565	264,583	611,667	10,368,221
Corn.....	2,143,899	6,400	262,228	1,058,333	11,199,544
Soybeans.....	350,315	350	57,603	217,957	3,441,773
Sorghum.....	3,679,083	33,208	822,312	1,305,208	15,857,085
Alfalfa.....		22,600	104,410	382,964	7,314,620
All other crops ¹	576,533	36,200	86,275	262,475	5,358,226
Total value of all crops lost.....					192,405,779

4. Restoration of established conservation practices:

	Amount	Estimated cost of repairs
(a) Terraces, miles damaged.....	6,335	\$332,940
(b) Stock water ponds, number damaged.....	3,359	291,925
(c) Diversion terraces, number damaged.....	856	37,775
(d) Terrace outlets, acres damaged.....	7,710	176,475
(e) Erosion control dams, number damaged.....	1,303	80,475

¹ List on back information for such crops as bromegrass seed, sweetclover seed, potatoes, etc.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to state that action on the program for flood control as proposed in the Pick-Sloan plan must be immediate.

It is true that not since 1903, 48 years ago, have we had a major flood in the Kaw River Valley. It is also true that we have floods practically every year in some sections of our State and every few years in the Kaw River Basin. Our engineers have given us a program. Congress knows the needs and the problem. Let us vote funds sufficient to get it underway immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an editorial I wrote on July 17, 1951, at the request of Ed Chapman, editor of the Topeka State Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD AND GO TO WORK

Kansas has been called bleeding Kansas—today that blood is the floodwaters spreading overwhelming disaster and carrying with them and lost forever a great wealth washed from our land and from our cities.

Kansas is traversed, blessed and cursed, by great river watersheds—the Kaw, Arkansas, Neosho, Verdigris, and Marais des Cygnes. We have never fully accented the blessings and all too often we receive the curses. Each of these streams is a constant flood hazard, each has frequently left its banks to destroy and lay waste.

Fifteen years ago the Federal Government accepted as a national duty the protection of its citizens from flood. It embarked on a program of construction which has caused many structures, dams, and walls to be built across the country. The Government accepted this burden for several reasons, but two are well worth reviewing. First, flood losses are total losses which take from the Nation wealth that can never be replaced, and disrupt communities frequently in times of national stress such as we are enduring this year. Second, with a rapidly growing population, and hence an increasing need for jobs and production—a program which will reduce preventable economic losses to a minimum is a national must.

Following that program, Kansas early obtained the money to build three small dams. In addition, planning was initiated in each of the flood basins to develop plans for prevention of future floods. These comprehensive plans for flood control, water runoff, and soil erosion were developed after years of study. Thousands of dollars were spent and volumes of data were gathered. The best engineering talent of the world was consulted and used to put in concrete form a proposal which would put in operation, structures that would forever remove the fear of flood. These plans are specific for each basin.

The Kaw will be made tame by means of 3 dams and 10 local protection projects to be built by the Corps of Engineers—several dams by the Bureau of Reclamation will provide waters for beneficial uses besides holding future floods.

The Neosho and Verdigris have similar plans and the Marais des Cygnes will also have its impounding dams.

In addition, a comprehensive and all-inclusive program has or is developing basic plans for the reduction of water runoff and erosion control through the Soil Conservation Service. These plans are a concurrent work, vitally necessary in order to protect

tributary watersheds, reduce land loss, preserve our soils and prevent silting of reservoirs.

There is no difference of opinion between the various governmental agencies on the effectiveness of this coordinated program. With reservoirs and the soil conservation program floods can be stopped.

After a good start, Kansas has lagged in getting its work done. True, the lag in part has been caused by honest democratic debate and delay. But while the debate has been intense—debate has never built a reservoir nor protected our valleys.

It is imperative that we have action and have it now. The floods have not neglected their opportunity and today Kansas is the recipient of sympathy from the Nation. Congress has passed emergency legislation. Foreign governments have expressed their sorrow to our President. These well-meaning gestures will never bring back the lost lives nor the soil nor the homes or factories. Nor will they prevent the same thing happening again.

The time for work is here—in fact we are away late. Let's forget our past arguments, let's get the job done—but fast.

It is my firm conviction, after detailed examination of the basic plans prepared by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, that if we work together among ourselves and with the Federal Government, in less than 10 years we can complete the necessary works.

Concurrently, our conservation districts working with the Department of Agriculture can complete those jobs necessary to hold the soil on the land. When that is done the floods will work for us. Our erosion can be reduced to negligible proportions, our towns and cities, our marketing centers, all will be safe.

We must never again have flood disaster in Kansas.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas has certainly given us a graphic picture of the results of the flood and the damage sustained by the people in the disaster areas. He has also shown a personal and intimate knowledge of the Pick-Sloan plan and the proposals for the prevention of future floods.

However, Mr. President, I wish to say to Members of the Senate that this is not a sudden conversion or show of interest in flood control on the part of the distinguished Senator from Kansas. It was my privilege to serve with him in the House of Representatives for a great many years, when he was a Member of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives. The interest which the Senator from Kansas shows today in flood control he also evinced back in the days of the late thirties and early forties, when he served in the House of Representatives and there had a great deal to do with the legislative enactments authorizing the projects which he is now supporting.

I mention the fact because when floods come and public interest is aroused, it is a nice thing for everyone to say, "This is something I am interested in." It is a sort of bandwagon proposition. The Senator from Kansas, on the other hand, was interested in flood control and in taking steps to prevent such damages

years ago. It was due to his work that some of the structures which have been completed were started. I have in mind particularly Smoky Hill, the Harlan Reservoir in Nebraska, and other projects along the Republican River and the tributaries of the Kaw River. The Senator from Kansas can speak with confidence and good conscience today, because he is not a Johnny Come Lately on the subject of flood control.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the fine remarks of the Senator from South Dakota. It was my privilege to work with him in the House of Representatives for many years. Jointly we worked on a program for complete control of water runoffs. As I stated earlier, it is a coordinated program of soil conservation, detention dams and reservoirs. It is a complete program. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota led the fight for many years for the control of the tributary streams by the construction of small reservoirs in the Case-Wheeler bill. Through the Bureau of Reclamation we have constructed one of those projects in Kansas, and I am hopeful that we can get other projects under way which will do much to control the flood waters of the streams which feed large rivers. I am advised that had we had two or three reservoirs on the tributaries, the Saline and Solomon Rivers in Kansas, it would have materially reduced the flood waters in those streams. At least 20 percent of the flood waters flowed down those streams and added that amount of water to the already swollen flood waters.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for the fine approach which he has taken and the information which he has set forth for the benefit of the Senate, especially when we are considering this important type of legislation. The Senator from Kansas has referred most appropriately to one important matter, namely, the proper amount of compensation which should be paid to those who must of necessity suffer the loss of their properties in the event the proposed dams are built. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague from Kansas if it is not true that considerable difficulty has developed not only in our State of Kansas but in some of the surrounding areas because of what would seem to be an inadequate amount of compensation paid to those who lost homes and farms which had been in their families for generations.

Mr. CARLSON. My distinguished colleague from Kansas raises a point which causes everyone difficulty when it is undertaken to secure land for dam sites or for inundation in a reservoir area, and to acquire easements which are necessary as the flood waters fill the reservoirs.

In our own State cases have arisen which have caused many of us considerable difficulty, and we have not been very happy about some of them. I am sincerely hopeful that when the Corps

of Army Engineers secures titles, easements, and rights-of-way, it will keep in mind the matter I mentioned earlier, namely, that in such circumstances a railroad or public utility or highway or bridge is relocated without cost to the owner, and in being relocated it is constructed in as good condition, if not better condition, than that in which it was before being relocated. In view of that situation, I contend that the farmer is entitled to the same consideration.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). Does the junior Senator from Kansas yield to his colleague?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I am sure that my distinguished colleague knows that before these projects are undertaken, they are submitted to the governors of the respective States. I know that my colleague is familiar with that situation, because he was Governor of our State of Kansas. So I am sure he realizes that in Kansas we have been aware of this situation. Let me say—if a personal reference may be pardoned—that I recall that when I was Governor of the State of Kansas, in a number of cases I made a report to the State senate and house of representatives, as provided by law, and to the Army engineers; and in the report I pointed out that while gas lines, transmission lines, and telephone and telegraph systems are rehabilitated, a similar attitude and view are not taken when private citizens are deprived of their property.

I think my colleague has brought out an excellent point today, namely, the need for some type of consideration on the part of the Army engineers for those whose property is taken, so that those who take the property may become aware of the great disparity which exists at times between establishing what is fair value when the owner of land in a valley is deprived of his property, and establishing what is fair value in relocating the property of railroads, utilities, or similar property.

I merely wish to say that I think the reference the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas has made to this matter will be most helpful to us in connection with reviewing the difficulties which have been visited on our State. They have been burdensome and heavy, but certainly they could not have been anticipated.

I join him in stressing the point that, inasmuch as we spend billions of dollars for aid to other nations of the world, and that aid comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers of our great country, therefore we should see to it—and I join my colleague in saying this—that some of these funds are used in the areas which have been devastated, so that we shall provide for the folks at home at least as well as we do for those who live in other countries.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the comments of my

colleague, the senior Senator from Kansas, who also served as Governor of our State for a term of 4 years. Of course, one who serves as Governor becomes well aware of the problems incident to the carrying out of a reservoir program. He is especially aware of that problem when he confers with the citizens of his State whose property is affected by the program. My colleague has had some of the same experiences I have had. That is why I desired to call this matter to the attention of the Senate.

I wish to say that, generally speaking and in the over-all view, the Corps of Army Engineers does an excellent job in acquiring these lands. I believe the Army engineers and their representatives will deal justly with our citizens who will be dislocated in the reservoir area.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Kansas on the able and learned address he has made on the subject of flood control. His address shows the enormous amount of thought and study which he has given to this problem.

Does not the difficulty we are having with much of the flood damage arise not so much because of the plan we are pursuing but because we have not had sufficient funds with which to carry out the plans and build the dams? Is it not true that much of the damage which occurred in the Senator's State might have been avoided if the flood-control projects which have been authorized had been constructed, although for one reason or another their construction has been delayed many years?

Mr. CARLSON. The junior Senator from Louisiana is absolutely correct. Had this program been carried out several years ago, the water crest in the valleys would have been materially lowered, and hundreds of millions of dollars of loss would have been avoided. Moreover, the water would have been held back in the tributary streams of our State, instead of being poured into Arkansas and Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is it not also true that it is poor economy to attempt to save money by too stringently withholding money for flood control, with the result that while we are waiting for the construction of the flood-control projects, we suffer enormous damage because of floods, such as the billion dollar damage to which the Senator has just referred?

Mr. CARLSON. That is absolutely correct. Once a reservoir is built, it protects the valley for many decades.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that one of our committees is considering a bill calling for the appropriation of \$8,000,000,000 for arms and economic aid for other sections of the world. If we are going to continue to shoulder the problems of almost all the other peoples of the world, is it not essential that we see to it that in our own country we have a productive system which will be sufficient to meet our own needs as well as the needs of other peoples?

Mr. CARLSON. There is no doubt that we must maintain a system which will enable us to meet the needs of both ourselves and of other peoples.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Before I conclude, Mr. President, I should like again to pay my respects to the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. McKELLAR], for the very fine way in which he has acted to take care of a flood which was practically over before he undertook the hearings on this measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Inasmuch as both Senators from Kansas are present at this time, I should like to say that in the committee we had this trouble in connection with the hearings on this matter: We had many witnesses from what is known as the Turtle Creek Valley, who wanted to have the plans of the Army engineers followed in connection with the building of a great dam there. Locally, there was the problem that many persons did not wish to be removed from their homes because of the construction of that dam. I can well understand that situation; it is natural for a man not to want to be removed from his home. Also, I understand that the valley is a very beautiful one. However, the plan which was offered by the other side cannot be followed, because we are obligated to follow the recommendations of the head of the Corps of Engineers.

I wish to say to both the Senators from Kansas that in my judgment it would help tremendously if they would use their influence in Kansas to get that situation corrected, because it is more or less a local situation and there should be some means by which the owners of the property can be paid for the just and fair value of their property, of course. If that can be done, I think the Turtle Creek Dam can be started very quickly; I hope it can be started not long after we pass this bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his remarks. I wish to say that I had the privilege of hearing the testimony taken by the committee, both the testimony for and the testimony against this particular proposal. I, too, am hopeful that there can be developed a program which will bring about a realization of the need for the construction of the reservoir, as well as the need for the protection of the people in the valley.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL BOXING CLUB

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished friend and colleague, the junior Senator from my neighboring State of Washington [Mr. CAIN], I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 191) submitted by Mr. WELKER (for himself and Mr. CAIN), was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcom-

mittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full study and investigation of the International Boxing Club with the view to ascertaining whether by restrictive contract practices, or otherwise, such club is preventing or hindering the entrance or advancement of professional boxers in the profession of boxing, or otherwise fostering unlawful restraints or monopolies, in professional boxing; whether or not the International Boxing Club, or any other person, firm, or corporation engaged in the promotion or management of national boxing events are in such control thereof as to deny or preclude opportunity to all those eligible the right to compete for the national boxing title championship; and whether or not the people of the United States are thereby denied full and unrestrained national competition for national boxing titles. The committee shall report the results of such study and investigation to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with its recommendations for such legislation or other action as it deems necessary.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, it is my firm opinion that the boxing profession has lost the confidence and respect of the American people, and that the boxing profession will disappear as a competitive art unless certain monopolistic practices are exposed and eliminated.

Never in history have all sports been so carefully subjected to the searching inquiry of the American people. We, the American people, are a sports-loving people, and I hope that we shall always so remain, but whenever the finger of suspicion is pointed at any sport, that sport is certain to suffer, and the athletes who engage in it will suffer. Therefore, I think it is reasonable to assume that all sports must come clean and are doing so.

In recent months we have had the basketball scandal, with the subsequent investigations. We have had the investigation of baseball, which investigation is now under way on the other side of the Capitol, and in recent days we have seen the scandal of West Point, which points the finger of suspicion at intercollegiate football. We have seen on the floor of the United States Senate two able Senators, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], advocate the abolition of intercollegiate football in our service institutions.

Mr. President, it is my firm opinion that all the sports heretofore mentioned are much cleaner, much more wholesome and more competitive than the professional sport of boxing as conducted today. In the resolution I have sent to the desk, I have asked that the Committee on the Judiciary make a full study and investigation of the International Boxing Club, to ascertain whether it has been engaging in vicious monopolistic contract practices, and whether it has, in fact, by such monopolistic practices, brought professional boxing to near ruin, to the detriment of the profession and many of the boxers. It goes without saying, and I think it is common knowledge, that the International Boxing Club is a closed corporation, which governs and controls the professional boxing business in almost every major city in the United States. It has nearly a wide-open field in the

handling of championship contestants, and as a result of the monopoly it exercises over contestants, promoters and managers, the boxing profession has reached a new low, to a point where it is ruined in the eyes of most of the American people. We have the shocking example, if you please, of fighters owned and controlled by the International Boxing Club, who have long since passed the peak of their fighting ability, and who stumble and wrestle with an opponent in a flimsy exhibition of the art of self-defense, in an attempt to achieve the world's championship, the highest honor that a professional boxer can obtain.

Only last month, Jersey Joe Walcott received his fifth chance for the heavyweight championship of the world. He was successful; and I always was an admirer of his, since he was always the underdog. He is a man either 39 or 40 years of age, the oldest champion-elect in the history of the heavyweight division. I am wondering how many boxing fans would pay \$20 to see our present champion go into the ring against the past illustrious champion of the world and credit to the boxing game, Joe Louis.

Where are the young fighters who can better represent the fistic champions in the ring today? What has happened to all of this material that we have been developing in gymnasiums all over the world and in our different universities? Why has it been on the decline, and why are we forced to watch boxing matches which are arranged by the International Boxing Club, boxing matches which put together two men who are no longer in their prime and who give us, in my opinion, a second-rate performance, to say the least?

Mr. President, I will tell you where the men are, and I will give you one living example of the huge monopoly that is practiced by the International Boxing Club in its complete monopoly of the able fighters of this Nation.

Harry "Kid" Matthews is an Idaho product—as much an Idahoan as William E. Borah, as Idaho potatoes, or as Sun Valley. Harry Matthews was born in Idaho 28½ years ago. I knew him when he was merely a child growing up in my neighboring towns of Ola and Emmett, Idaho. I saw him in one of his first fistic encounters. From that time, I knew his destiny was fame in the professional ring. I watched him grow from a small boy to the greatest uncrowned champion in the United States. I see everything in Harry Matthews to admire. He is a fine family man and a devout Christian. He was a combat soldier in World War II, and distinguished himself and the Nation he fought for. As I stated a moment ago, he is a professional boxer, one whom I proudly call my friend. He has the amazing record of 94 professional bouts. Of these, Harry Matthews has won 53 by knockouts, 32 decisions, and 6 having ended in draws. My friend, Harry Matthews, has in his entire career been defeated only 3 times. I should tell my friends and this Nation that this distinguished American has won his last 59 consecutive bouts, and I ask anyone in this Nation to compare a

top-flight fighter who can match that record.

A few years ago Harry Matthews was taken over by Jack Hurley, a gentleman I know by reputation only as one of the most respected and honest managers in the prize-fighting profession. Under the able leadership of Mr. Hurley, Harry Matthews has won 24 out of 24 prize fights, 19 of which were by knockout and 5 by decision.

Mr. President, on March 2, 1951, I proudly watched my friend, Harry Matthews, by television, as this country boy from Idaho came into the famous Madison Square Garden in New York to fight one of the leading prize fighters in the light-heavyweight division, "Irish" Bob Murphy. Many thousands of tickets were sold and this fight was billed that the winner would meet Joey Maxim for the world championship. Mr. President, Harry Matthews met "Irish" Bob Murphy, on that date, and decisively whipped him, and I think the decision was overwhelming. In fact, I remember that one judge voted 8 to 2. Mr. "Irish" Bob Murphy, the defeated gladiator, fights most generally for the International Boxing Club, and notwithstanding the fact that he was beaten all over the ring in Madison Square Garden on the night of March 2, the fact remains that Harry Matthews lives now in his adopted home in Seattle, Wash., picking up a fight and winning a fight wherever he can find one; but the man he so overwhelmingly defeated in March of this year, "Irish" Bob Murphy, due to the monopoly and the restraint of trade that International Boxing Club holds over professional fighters, the man who was whipped and beaten, instead of Harry Matthews, is getting the chance at the world's championship against Joey Maxim.

Mr. President, the people of the entire West, where champions are rare, are asking what happened to Harry "Kid" Matthews. Why is he not being given the chance for the world's championship—the chance that he earned by honest athletic endeavor and the chance that was promised to him? Mr. President, not only the people of the West, but the people of this Nation are asking that same question. Some 25,000,000 spectators through television and radio saw my Idaho friend go to the heights that no Idahoan has ever achieved in boxing. Some 25,000,000 people ask: "What happened to Harry 'Kid' Matthews?" and my answer to those 25,000,000 people is that because Harry "Kid" Matthews is not owned and controlled by the International Boxing Club—because he refuses to sell a share here and share there of his body to professional racketeers—Harry Matthews is left at the station, and right at the peak of his career he is denied the championship fight that was promised to him. Yes, I say this: that the International Boxing Club has with premeditated design attempted to bypass the ability of Harry Matthews. I say, that after Murphy was decisively beaten by Matthews, Murphy was fed, by the International Boxing Club, a series of small fights around the country until fans forgot

about the Matthews victory over Murphy, and that in July the master minds of the boxing game—the International Boxing Club—set up another one of its "house" fighters, Jake LaMotta, in the ring with Murphy, with the winner again to meet Maxim for the light-heavyweight championship of the world. So on August 22 the red-blooded fight fans of America will see an injustice perpetrated upon them when they pay to see or listen to the Murphy-Maxim fight, because in honesty and justice, in fairness and decency, the match should be Matthews versus Maxim.

I am mindful of the fact, Mr. President, that we have very serious matters in this Nation much more important than boxing, baseball and what-not, but are we, as Senators, going to sit idly by and permit a monopoly to exist right in our faces, and permit one of the greatest of American sports to deteriorate and to go into disrepute? I am a great believer in competition, both physical and mental, and I have had a great deal of satisfaction over engaging in and following the prize-fight profession since I was a youth. Therefore, I say that it is my duty to be interested in America to the extent that I shall attempt to expose this vicious monopolistic practice which is handled by the International Boxing Club. I realize, and I have been told, that it is all-powerful, that it controls the boxing profession, and that I will be wasting my time to sponsor this resolution. That may be true, Mr. President, but I assure the International Boxing Club that it will promote honest competitive fights or I shall ask the reason why, as long as I am in public life. The International Boxing Club is never going to be permitted to squeeze Harry Matthews or any other athlete out of the laurels that are his, by virtue of its monopoly so long as I have a voice in the Senate of the United States. I hate little vicious cliques that band together to buy this or that piece of someone, and who then control the destiny of not only one prize fighter but the destiny of most championships in our Nation. It amounts to flesh peddling and it has no place in America, especially in a highly competitive field such as boxing. So I ask the Senate of the United States, What constitutes monopoly? Is not the International Boxing Club operating in restraint of trade with interstate products when such athletes as Harry Matthews are refused a chance at the championship of the world when it has been promised to him, and which he has richly earned?

I want the Committee on the Judiciary, or some other committee, to ascertain why he was refused that fight. Was it because he would not agree to sign a long-term contract with the International Boxing Club, or was it because he refused to sell a share of his body and his talent to certain of the men closely identified with this club? Mr. President, the American people are demanding these answers, and not just the Senator from Idaho.

I am mindful of the accusations which might be made against me, that I am doing a job of assessment work for my

friend, Harry Matthews; but I wish to say to the Senate that I am not alone in my demands for a full and complete examination of the International Boxing Club and of its treatment of Harry Matthews. My distinguished friend and colleague from the great State of Washington will soon address the Senate on his observations of the treatment which Harry Matthews, who has adopted residence in his State, has received.

Mr. President, how do the prize-fight people of America feel when they pick up the August 1951 issue of Ring magazine, whose president and editor is Nat Fleischer, who writes on page 20 of the August issue as follows:

Now that Joey Maxim has proved that he is a far better light-heavyweight than he is a heavy, he should settle down to business and give those in his division who have qualified as challengers, a chance to fight for his crown. The outstanding men in the division are Archie Moore and Harry Matthews.

Each has been clamoring for a championship bout and each continues to keep in the fistful spotlight as a contender. If boxing commissions throughout our country were more alert and stopped playing politics in an effort to get lucrative contests for their territory, Maxim long ago would have been forced to defend his crown or vacate it. The same was true of Ike Williams, who was recently deposed by James Carter.

Dodging legitimate challengers is a pastime that is engaged in by most champions but it wasn't that way before boxing became a huge commercial business. We would like to see Maxim defend his crown against Harry Matthews since he and Jack Kearns, his manager, declare that Moore is no drawing card. At least Matthews is, and that's more than can be said of Maxim and Charles as attractions in their recent fight. Had Matthews instead of Maxim been pitted against Charles, I'd be willing to wager dollars to doughnuts that at least twice the gathering would have been present for such a contest with a gate of upward of \$150,000.

Matthews is the logical man for Maxim. He rates above Bob Satterfield and should be given first crack at the crown. He can box. He can punch. He has a fighting heart and is most colorful. He's an excellent drawing card who would do well against either Maxim or Charles but it's Joey he's after and not Ezzard.

It's too bad that a fighter like Matthews is kept on the side lines by the International Boxing Club while lesser lights who cannot draw half as well are given preference because of protective measures. The IBC apparently cannot handle Matthews' manager, the colorful Jack Hurley, and that's the reason for shunning Matthews.

In California, a bill has been introduced in the assembly aimed specifically at the International Boxing Club and its control of most champions and top-ranking fighters. The measure would prevent any fight promoter or fight club which controls or holds an interest in a boxer from being allowed to "share or participate in promotion of a prize fight in California." The State Athletic Commission would be prohibited from issuing a license for any fight in which any agent other than the manager of the boxer received a share of the latter's purse.

Assemblyman Maloney, of San Francisco, father of the bill, and George D. Collins, cosponsor, declared:

We aim at breaking the fistful monopoly of the New York club, the IBC, which recently received a fat share of the \$95,000 receipts of the Andy Walker against Joe Louis fight in San Francisco and the Charles-Pat Valentino mill. In each case, the promoter, Bill Kyne and later Kyne and Jim Murray, gave either a guaranty or a percentage to the IBC.

Is this matter serious? I read a United Press dispatch from Seattle, Wash., on August 9 that the Attorney General of Washington, Smith Troy, was preparing a suit against International Boxing Club over its treatment of Harry Matthews.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to listen again to what the leader of boxing in America, Nat Fleischer, has to say in part:

Now Joe and Floyd are brothers in arms with Jim Norris (of the International Boxing Club) and they've made good their boast with vengeance. They haven't broken the monopoly, but they have cornered the market on world title bouts and other major contests.

Mr. President, in the September issue of Ring magazine for 1951 this great leader and writer of boxing in America has this to say, and I quote from page 16 of Ring magazine:

Following Murphy's victory an announcement was made by Jim Norris, of the International Boxing Club, that in a conference with Doc Kearns, manager of Maxim, an agreement was reached to have Maxim defend his light-heavyweight crown against either Murphy or Bob Satterfield in August in New York.

No mention of the most deserving challenger, Matthews, was made until one of the scribes asked about Jack Hurley's great fighter. Norris declared that he had offered Matthews several opponents in New York, Detroit, and Chicago. Each had been turned down, but the door was not locked.

"If he wants to fight for the IBC and is willing to accept our terms, we are ready to talk business," said Norris. One could read between the lines that Matthews had been pushed aside to make way for the man whom he beat.

This is unjust and unsportsmanlike in boxing, as in all other sports. I hope sportsmanship still rules. Matthews has earned a title shot. He is a scientific boxer and tremendously powerful hitter. He proved his worth in beating Murphy.

I'm certain that if it were left to Bob, the Irish lad would stand aside to let his conqueror try his hand against Maxim and then take his chance on meeting the winner.

Matthews, more than even our No. 1 rated light heavyweight, Archie Moore, has earned the right to a championship match. He is entitled to it more than is Murphy.

The public will come out for a Murphy-Maxim fight because of their hero worship, but they'll do the same to see Jack Hurley's man tackle Maxim. The fair thing is to give Matthews first crack at Joey, then let Murphy have a second try at Harry if Matthews succeeds in winning the crown.

That's the squarest way of handling the light-heavyweight problem. If the NBA and New York commission want to help an honest, honorable fight manager, Jack Hurley, and an equally honorable fighter, get their just dues, they should use their good offices to obtain the title bout for Matthews.

Though Hurley has declared that he will never again appear in the Garden or any

IBC promotion where television will keep down the gate, things have changed in recent weeks.

The banning of television in IBC promotions until the October indoor season contracts get under way for another year, should be considered favorably by Hurley, even though a bout with Maxim would be staged after the new contracts begin.

If Matthews should beat Maxim, he would come in for the big dough in future fights and that would be ample recompense for settling his feud with Jim Norris. The IBC needs Matthews as much as Harry and Hurley need the International Boxing Club and since boxing involves business, it is up to Hurley to quit fighting the International Boxing Club.

Norris is fooling no one when he says Matthews can come into the Garden at any time and that he also is being considered for a winter title match. That will never happen unless Hurley and Jim get together.

Many years have elapsed since such a field of excellent light-heavyweight talent has appeared in world boxing. Moore, for a number of years our number one contender; Matthews, Murphy, Cockell, Harold Johnson, and Don Bucceroni—it's been a long time since such men have graced the top sector of the division. Here's the chance of a lifetime for a big time promotion and Norris and Hurley should make the most of it.

In conclusion, Mr. President, there is very little else that I can say. I have given the Senate a word picture of the monopoly as exercised by the International Boxing Club. If this resolution is adopted I want the committee not only to investigate the International Boxing Club but any other person, club, or commission that rears its ugly head in competitive boxing and seeks to assert monopolistic control over the boxing profession. Let us not waste our time by mere perfunctory examination but let us get to the meat of the boxing profession that we have seen fall into disrepute in recent years. There must be a reason. American youth still loves to fight for prizes and for wealth, but we now have seen the boxing profession go down to a point where our athletes are old, and not real champions. They have served their time and they can be completely defeated if they are given a fight with a youthful competitor. We have seen the contestants owned, operated, and controlled by clubs and individuals who control the entire boxing business. This must stop. Baseball, as it is being investigated on the other side of the Capitol at this moment, is a wholesome, clean profession beyond disgrace and will ever rest upon a high level because baseball itself cleaned house. Boxing has failed to clean house.

I have told the Senate the story, as I know it, about IBC and Harry Matthews. Senators can see what it has done to the light-heavyweight division of professional boxing. I am sure other Senators are familiar with many other contestants who have been foreclosed the right to go to the top of the ladder in the competitive field of boxing.

I trust that the resolution will be the effective means of completely airing the story of monopoly in boxing.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as the cosponsor of the resolution which has just

been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I wish to submit some views.

In recent days a considerable amount of interest has been shown by several Members of the Congress and a number of sports-minded lay persons in the possibility and desirability of an investigation of professional boxing by appropriate committees of the Congress.

On August 6, Representative L. GARY CLEMENTE, of New York, submitted a resolution to investigate the professional sport of boxing. The resolution was referred to the House Rules Committee.

On August 10 my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, submitted a resolution to pursue the same inquiry. This resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Some 2 weeks ago the attorney general of the State of Washington, Mr. Smith Troy, stated publicly that he was going to request the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. J. Howard McGrath, to undertake an investigation of professional boxing.

It has been requested by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] that the resolution he has offered today be referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The resolution directs that a full study and investigation be made of the International Boxing Club.

The several resolutions in question and all of the interest in the several resolutions are directed to the same end. It is hoped that some appropriate committee of the Congress will endeavor to determine if qualified and talented professional prize fighters are being denied opportunities to compete for championships in the various boxing classes. Certainly the junior Senator from Idaho and the junior Senator from Washington have no particular pride of authorship in the resolution which has been sent to the desk today. We will gladly assist and testify before any committee of the Congress which may undertake the study of professional boxing which is desired.

It seems to me that the presentation of professional boxing which, through the medium of television, is viewed in millions of American homes, is in need of a complete and thorough congressional study to determine whether, through illegal or questionable promotional or managerial monopoly, or both, the American public is being deprived of performance by the best available talent and whether outstanding talent is being shunted aside regardless of proven qualifications in the interest of other less able talent controlled by promotional or managerial monopolies, or both.

The mission of professional sports, including boxing, is that of playing an important part in the American sports picture by stressing the value of competition, which has already contributed greatly to the good of our country, and by setting examples of the highest ideals of sportsmanship, as well as proving the value of physical fitness.

In these premises, it is thought by some of us that professional boxing is presently maintained on a level far below the normal principles and ideals of sportsmanship.

Championship boxing bouts in recent years have not always been conducted in a manner to inspire the youth of America. Champions have not always conducted themselves in a manner described by the simple dictionary explanation of the word "champion."

I can best illustrate this viewpoint by describing several examples. Among boxing students and authorities, it is generally conceded that Harry Matthews of Seattle, Wash., is an outstanding light-heavyweight challenger, who is presently being denied an opportunity to fight for the championship of his class. Within a few days, Joey Maxim the light-heavyweight champion, will defend his title against Irish Bob Murphy. The latter has been very successful in the past several years and is likely to defeat the champion who has fought, but seldom in recent years—and when he did, he did it not very well. It happens that Matthews and Murphy fought not long ago and the announced understanding was that the winner would be matched against the champion. Matthews completely outclassed Murphy in every way. For reasons which the Congress ought to determine the understanding was not carried out, and Murphy is now being given a chance to win a great title, while Matthews, acknowledged to be Murphy's superior in every respect, is being denied the chance which he has earned completely.

I wish to say, Mr. President, as the Senator from Idaho has said, that Harry Matthews is a product of the sovereign and illustrious State of Idaho. However, Harry Matthews has lived as a constituent of mine in the State of Washington for some time. Along with every other sports-minded citizen in the State of Washington, I share in the pride which the State of Idaho has for a very splendid and vigorous young American.

Archie Moore, of Missouri, is another outstanding example of an outstanding challenger for the light heavyweight title who has been denied the opportunity to fight for the championship of his class. It is my understanding that Archie Moore has now reached the point where he is over the hill, and on the other side, on his way down to oblivion, after having been an outstanding contender for years, and always denied an opportunity to win a championship match.

I have often heard it said by those in the sport who ought to know that many a good boxer, who is ably managed, is prevented from getting his foot inside of the door until he "cuts in" part of his managerial fees to some member of a New York managerial monopoly. I do not know how much truth there may be in this contention. A competent congressional inquiry would determine the facts.

On Wednesday of this week Joe Louis will box Jimmy Bivins in Baltimore. This bout will be promoted by the International Boxing Club, which many know as the Madison Square Garden of New York. I remember that when Joe Louis boxed Tom Roper in Los Angeles some years ago the bout was promoted by Mike Jacobs, of New York. When Joe Louis boxed Buddy Baer here in Washington that contest was promoted by Mike

Jacobs, and the referee was imported from New York.

It may be recalled that when Joe Louis and Billy Conn, both men then being in the Army, offered to box for the benefit of war charities, the offer never materialized because the New York promoter, Mike Jacobs, insisted upon collecting from the gate receipts a certain sum of money which Jacobs claimed Joe Louis owed to him. How Mr. Jacobs could have maintained this attitude in the face of a New York statute I do not know. This statute says in part:

No corporation shall have, either directly or indirectly, any financial interest in a boxer—competing on premises owned or leased by a corporation or in which such corporation is otherwise interested.

The value of professional boxing ought to be weighed objectively as a national sport, stressing the sports contribution to the combat-mindedness of our Nation, for this combat instinct cannot be fostered in a Nation by means of canasta and croquet.

While such great sports as football and baseball teach the tremendous value of team play as applied to every walk of life, boxing produces characteristics and values peculiar to that strenuous sport. Boxing teaches the will to stand alone and to fight alone without the help of team mates who will block out a tackle or advance a base runner by a sacrifice bunt. There come times in the lives of all of us, and most particularly in the lives of those who serve in uniform under fire, when we must stand alone and fight it out alone. In preparation for such an emergency, boxing teaches one not to quit when the going is rough and tough. Military leaders stress the value of boxing as the basis of hand-to-hand conflict. The man who knows the correct block, side-step, and counter will instinctively employ the correct tactics whether the opposition be a fellow wearing boxing gloves or an enemy armed with knife or bayonet.

This is not to say that only graduates of the prize-fight ring make good hand-to-hand fighters, but it does stress the value of boxing tactics, which are impressed upon all of those who witness boxing bouts.

Professional boxing is not the sole property of promoters or groups of promoters. The sport belongs to the American public, which has the right to expect the best presentation of the sport, and ought not to be subjected to a forced diet of mediocre, second-, or third-best boxing bouts when better bouts are available.

For many years the boxing commissions of the various States of the Union have been banded together in the National Boxing Association. Its membership included commissions from foreign countries as well as from municipal commissions. A total of 86 boxing commissioners belong to the National Boxing Association.

It is a singular fact that New York has constantly declined to join this "Union of States" formed in the interest of sportsmanship, uniformity, cooperation, and control. The National Boxing Association will hold its thirty-first

annual convention in Chicago next month. I have been told by some of its officers that the problems to be discussed in that convention are the same ones which concern me now and will be of concern to any committee of the Congress which undertakes a study of professional boxing in America. It goes without saying that the National Boxing Association will cooperate in any investigation which may be undertaken by any committee of the Congress.

I have gladly joined with the Senator from Idaho in urging that the Congress undertake an investigation of professional boxing. There are few among us who ever have been a part of professional boxing. We may have little appreciation of or sympathy for this sport. That, however, is not what now concerns us. For as long as professional boxing is a legitimate sport we must make as certain as we can that every qualified fighter is given a chance to compete for the championship, and that monopolistic control does not prevent the American public from witnessing the best matches which can be arranged. It is because of this reasonable opinion that I have joined with the Senator from Idaho and with other interested parties in urging that an appropriate committee of the Congress undertake a thorough examination of the health and procedures of professional boxing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With my colleague's permission and the permission of the Senator from Idaho I should like to join in the sentiments expressed here today during the presentation of the facts on this subject.

Mr. President, I have no pride of authorship in the resolution which I have prepared. I have been thinking about this subject for some time, because of my long friendship with Mr. Hurley, with whom I grew up in Minnesota. Also, the individual about whom we are talking comes from Idaho and the Pacific Northwest, and now resides in Seattle.

Approximately 4 or 5 days ago I received a letter from the attorney general of the State of Washington. I then directed my staff to prepare a resolution. It so happened that it was ready for submission at the same time the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Washington evidenced a similar desire. I did not know of the activities of the Senator from Idaho and my colleague from Washington. However, we are all trying to achieve the same end. I hope such an investigation as has been proposed may be conducted. The facts have been very well presented by the Senator from Idaho and my colleague from Washington.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, being one of the authors of the resolution sent to the desk, I wish to state that we are delighted, thrilled, and honored to have the able help and association of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington. We will gladly work with him.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to my colleague that I take it that all of us are in agreement. We

hope that many other persons will soon become familiar with the subject. Fundamentally, our only ambition is to see that every qualified American has the opportunity to fight for the championship of his class. It is a good thing, in a personal way, for the two Senators from Washington and the Senator from Idaho to conspire, as it were, for the success and happiness of an individual, Harry Matthews, whom we know and respect, and who happens to have been brought up in our part of the Northwest.

CIVIL-FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4386) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments regarding the pending bill. As a Member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions it has been my privilege to attend practically all of the hearings which were conducted on the pending appropriation bill. The hearings began on the 28th of June and continued until July 30. During that time the committee was in session both mornings and afternoons of most days. I do not know the exact number of witnesses whom the committee heard, but it was in excess of 100. There were hundreds of others who manifested interest in and support of the bill by their presence. They were not merely people from Washington. They were people from practically every State in the Union. They were people who live in areas which have flood control problems, or have need of water conservation, or have great potentials of hydroelectric power, which, when developed, would strengthen the economy in those sections of our country.

When I first became a Member of Congress, in 1935, I had little knowledge and very little interest in flood control, river and harbor, and water resources development. Prior to the time that I campaigned for Congress in 1934 the principal flood I had heard of was the one for which Noah had built his ark. When I got into the campaign I found that my district extended down the Arkansas River to its mouth and to the Mississippi River. There was a very acute flood control problem in that particular area at that time. A proposal was pending which was known as the Jadwin plan. It became my responsibility, and I immediately became interested in flood-control legislation. I sought assignment to the House Flood Control Committee, and was successful in obtaining the assignment. There I served during the 4 years I was a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas and I entered the House of Representatives at the same time. Both of us became members of the Flood Control Committee. I am familiar with the hard work the Senator

did on the problems which were of direct concern to him, particularly with reference to some floodways. We sat in hearings day after day, week in and week out, and month in and month out. It was very educational. I know of no one who took a greater personal interest than did the Senator from Arkansas in the problem of flood control, not only as affecting the streams which flow across his State, but in the problem of flood control throughout the Nation. It was a privilege to work with him during those years, as it is pleasant to be associated with him again in this work in the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I remember those days when he and I were members of the Committee on Flood Control in the House, and my association with him at that time was very pleasant, just as it has been in the Senate. I recall that he and I were both struggling along with this new responsibility, and were trying to learn something about it and get our bearings. It was there that I got the initial concept of the great economic potentiality of our national water resources.

From that time on I have been a strong advocate of flood control to protect our soil, our valleys, and the inhabitants of the valleys and their property, and I have realized also, as I now realize more keenly than ever before, the great economic resources and potentialities which we have and which we can develop from the great natural resource, water.

Mr. President, I believe the State of Arkansas has as many miles of navigable rivers as any other State in the Union, if not more. Therefore, we have tremendous flood-control problems. I may say that most of that mileage is in rich, fertile valleys. In the upper regions of some of the tributaries there is a hilly section and a small mountainous area, where there is not much land that can be developed for cultivation. In that area we have the potentiality of great hydroelectric resources. As we construct those dams we not only develop the power which will repay the cost of construction, but we build multipurpose dams, which make great contributions to flood control in the rich alluvial valleys, and make it possible, along with levees, cut-offs, and other improvements, to fully protect those valleys and enable the people to go in there and make investments and thoroughly develop them into their full economic strength.

Mr. President, that explains why I am vitally interested in this character of legislation and in appropriations for this purpose. As I learn about the possibilities of my own State in this particular area of progress, I also am able to envision fairly well what such development means to other sections of our country and what it means to the economic strength and power of our great United States of America.

Mr. President, I have stood on this floor on more than one occasion and talked about economy in Government. I doubt if I need yield to any of my colleagues in respect to the depth of my sincerity in what I have had to say about

the necessity for economy in this Government. I grant to others the same sincerity that I ascribe to myself. I believe that practically every Member of this body, under the present fiscal strain, is genuinely concerned about economy and is trying to pursue sound fiscal policies.

It is true that in our compelling necessity to economize, we could refuse to make appropriations for any flood-control works, for any river and harbor projects, for any development of our natural resources. By so doing, we could eliminate all the items of this bill. I believe this bill calls for appropriations totaling \$637,000,000, and we could avoid all of that expenditure by simply refusing to vote for any of the projects provided for in the bill. However, in that event, we would have to take losses, because certain contracts have been made. By following such a course, although we seemingly would avoid the expenditure of \$637,000,000, nevertheless we would incur substantial losses, probably equal to that amount or at least equal to a considerable portion of it, by reason of discontinuing projects which already are under construction and leaving exposed areas which will be protected when the works provided for in this appropriation bill are completed.

I do not believe anyone can successfully challenge the statement that such a course would be the rankest sort of false economy, Mr. President. To stop such programs to stop developing any of our resources which make our Nation stronger economically and afford protection to property and investments and create a livelihood for our people in the valleys, would simply be to turn back the clock and stop progress and go into reverse gear, so to speak. Thus, instead of strengthening our Nation, as will be done by continuing the construction of these projects, the economic strength of our Nation would be weakened, and our military might and power would thus be impaired.

Mr. President, it is not practical to follow such a course. It would be unwise to do so; it would be stupid to do so.

Therefore, as we approach the problem of making the necessary appropriations for carrying on this program and meeting this problem, we approach it on the basis of what we can afford to do, as measured against what we cannot afford not to do; and in that process we have presented this bill, which lies somewhere between the two extremes, and represents as near a middle course as the collective wisdom and judgment of the Appropriations Committee could find.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether he considers it more important to develop the resources of our own country and to prevent floods which destroy life and property, rather than to

continue in the way that the State Department apparently intends to do—for example, with the \$25,000,000 which has been allocated to Iran and with the loans which we make to Mexico for irrigation development and flood-control development there, without mentioning 8 or 10 other areas in foreign countries, with which no doubt the Senator is just as familiar as I am? Does the distinguished Senator from Arkansas consider it necessary for us to examine and consider our own resources and to treat our own country on a basis at least equal to that on which we treat the other nations of the world, in connection with the spending of our own money for irrigation, flood control, and power development?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that before I conclude, I intend to make a comparison and to place in the Record some calculations I have made, which clearly indicate that even with the appropriations made in this bill and those made in other measures already enacted at this session and those carried in other appropriation bills which will be enacted—for instance, the appropriations for reclamation work, in connection with the Department of the Interior appropriation bill—the total of such expenditures, including those carried in this bill, is hardly a drop in the bucket as compared with the over-all expenditures we shall be called upon to make this year.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator about the following situation: For 50 years our flood-control policy has been to depend largely on the reports of the Army engineers, which are scrutinized carefully by the congressional committees; and whenever the revenue from such projects is greater than the cost, the difference is returned to the Treasury. I am sure that the Senator from Arkansas agrees with me that in the case of irrigation developments, it is necessary, whenever—following a proper investigation by the Department of the Interior—such a development is found to be feasible, to have the cost of the project, without interest, repaid on a definite amortization basis, whereas in connection with power development in the main the policy has been to repay the cost to the United States Government with interest.

In connection with following that long-established policy and developing our own country along that line, does the Senator agree with me that it would be well for the various committees of the Senate, rather than the State Department, to examine closely the proposed expenditures in foreign countries and to consider them on the same basis? In other words, instead of simply making the grants under the point 4 program or the Export-Import Bank program or the World Bank program, or the ECA program, or the Marshall plan, or any one of a dozen other tricks to get money out of the United States Treasury, without repayment, would not it be better for us to proceed at least on the basis that is used in connection with our own devel-

opment, and to study such proposals on that basis? As a shining example, we have the allocation of \$25,000,000 to Iran probably without any hope of repayment. That allocation is made in the hope of quieting the oil situation in Iran. Why should we spend \$25,000,000 of our money in that way, and at the same time support England in her position? It seems to me a little queer, to say the least, to have us do both of those things. I do not understand that situation.

Does not the Senator from Arkansas think we should treat our own country on a basis at least equal to that on which we treat foreign countries, in connection with the spending of our own money?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say to the Senator that in my opinion the basis should not be simply an equal one, but we should take care of our own people first.

Mr. MALONE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Without attempting to debate the merits of the Marshall plan aid to Greece and Turkey or other foreign aid, is it not a fact that Congress can completely end such programs whenever it sees fit to do so, whereas if we leave in the pending appropriation bill all provisions for the commencement of new projects, we shall be committed to the expenditure of between \$5,000,000,000 and \$6,000,000,000; and if we accept the Missouri Valley program and all the other valley programs and the St. Lawrence seaway program, we shall add projects calling for an additional \$25,000,000,000 or \$50,000,000,000? In connection with all such programs, is it not said that once we begin them, we cannot stop them?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course we should not stop them once they are started.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President, I do not think that can be said.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee why it cannot be said.

Mr. McKELLAR. For instance, let us consider the four new projects provided for in the pending measure. This bill provides for only four new projects, and only \$35,000,000 is estimated for them. The total cost of those projects, when they are completed, will amount to considerably more than that, but nothing like billions of dollars. In just a minute I shall give the Senator the exact figures.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can state the exact figures; they were stated to our committee, for the five projects which I do not think should be provided for in the bill. They total \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is mistaken about that. All the new projects call for just a little more than \$500,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I refer to the four big dams and the one floodway. We were told that they would cost \$500,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Elimination of them now would, it is true, save \$28,500,000, but that is only a beginning.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator said \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will examine the RECORD, he will find that he said that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then it was a lapsus linguae. I certainly intended to say \$500,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator, I take it, admits that he said \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But the projects in the bill were between \$5,000,000,000 and \$6,000,000,000; and the Senator from Virginia repeats that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is mistaken, and I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that the RECORD would not bear him out. The committee hearings would not bear him out. The Senator did not hear the testimony. The Senator was present but about 15 minutes during the entire time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Tennessee is exaggerating.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I am not exaggerating. The Senator came to the committee room to talk about the Buggs Island project for about 15 minutes; then he came in after Buggs Island project had been included, and he left again in less than 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia was there for a good many hours, until he gave up all hope of stopping anything in the bill. After that he did not go any more.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is opposed to this bill now, and he has been opposed to it all the time. I advise him to vote against it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will permit me to make one observation, it has been a little mysterious to the junior Senator from Nevada, during the four and a half years he has been a Member of the Senate, to observe what a great scare it throws into individual Senators when \$1,000,000,000 is mentioned in connection with flood control, rivers and harbors, irrigation and reclamation, or power development in this country, whereas \$8,000,000,000 is taken for granted as hardly worth studying when it is to go to foreign nations for the same purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That may be true. My position with reference to these projects is that, in the first place, no project should be started until it is thoroughly surveyed and appraised as to its economic value, and until its economic value is weighed as against its cost; that is, until there is a comparison between estimated benefits and estimated costs. Then, once it is determined that it is sound economically, as fast as the Government can afford to do so without weakening its fiscal policy, the projects should be constructed. It does not at all frighten me to have someone say that there are probably in America projects of this character which would require an additional \$10,000,000,000 or \$15,000,-

000,000, to construct and to which we are looking forward.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think there are quite that many more.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are probably more than that.

Mr. President, while it has been said on the floor this afternoon that we cannot control floods on every little stream in the United States—with which I agree, too—nevertheless I say that America will become economically stronger and stronger and more productive as we consider, initiate, and build projects of this character, which are worth while and which are sound economically. America's strength will grow in proportion to the speed with which we are able to carry forward this program and to develop the great resources which are latent in our waters and in our streams and in our valleys.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree 100 percent with the Senator. He is entirely correct. I know from the experience in my own State that the building of dams and the use of cheap electricity have done more for farmers probably than for any other class of people. They have done more good, probably, than any other public project within the State. I would a thousand times rather spend \$622,000,000 in order to build big projects in this country than to turn \$8,500,000,000 over to someone, to be spent in countries in Europe or elsewhere, when we do not know how it is to be spent, and when there are no limitations whatsoever upon its spending.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator, the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I want to pay this tribute to him, Mr. President, at this time. He was present at these hearings, as I recall, every minute of the time during that period of over 30 days that hearings were held, except for the few minutes he was absent one morning by reason of a conference with the President at the White House. He conducted the hearings in such a manner as to develop as thoroughly as possible, on the basis of the available evidence, the merit or lack of merit of the requests which came before the committee. He worked diligently. I was happy to serve with him, because I feel that in this work we are actually serving the Nation, when we examine the proposals thoroughly, and then, even in a time of economic stress such as the present, submit recommendations that money be spent to construct the projects. We do it because we have examined them and have gone thoroughly into them and have found that their construction will not be an expense to the Government, in the proper analysis, but an investment in property which will be productive of opportunities for livelihood for generations yet unborn, and which will increase the productive capacity of the Nation and will help us meet the challenge when the day comes, when the dark hour is upon us, if another world war should be inevitable.

When the final test comes, Mr. President, in my judgment, the determining factor will be, How strong are we here in America? not How much money did you give away to foreign countries? Our strength here is going to determine whether communism is to sweep the world, or whether it is to fail in its final attack, in that supreme assault, when it is made. Yes, I know we are spending money in foreign countries. I have been willing to spend part of it. I voted for a reduction in ECA funds every time I had the opportunity, because, as has been suggested or implied here this afternoon, I think in that many instances we spent \$2 when \$1 would have done the job. I suppose we are not able to go abroad to survey projects there as we do the projects in America. They are not examined so carefully; but we spend the money. I have been willing to do that, and I am still willing to help to some extent. I am still willing to go along on helping to arm them. But I have about concluded that it is time to discontinue the economic aid that we have been giving. The countries whom we have aided now have greater productive capacity than they had before the beginning of World War II. If, after we have rehabilitated them to that extent, they cannot go forward, if that does not give them the necessary momentum to enable them to be self-sustaining, I do not know, Mr. President, but it would seem to me that some have in mind such a program should continue indefinitely, and I know that would not be wise for them nor for us. The economic-aid program should end at some time. I think that time is about here.

Mr. President, in that connection, I should like to refer to Senate bill 1762, which I have before me. It is a bill to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international security. The bill is now before the Foreign Relations Committee, where hearings, I think, are now being held on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, before he leaves the subject we were discussing, relative to the new dams which are to be started, and which are authorized by this bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will wait a moment, until I give these figures, I shall then be glad to yield to him. These figures will fit in with what we are discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to wait.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I find in this bill, S. 1762, authority to appropriate \$1,675,000,000 for assistance pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

It authorizes \$125,000,000 for economic aid and technical assistance to Africa and the Near East. It authorizes \$262,500,000 for economic and technical assistance in those portions of the Far East which the President deems to be not under Communist control, and an additional \$22,000,000 is authorized for technical assistance in the Western Hemisphere. These sums so authorized total \$2,197,000,000, which it is proposed

we give away as economic aid and technical assistance to foreign countries during this fiscal year. It is not military assistance. Proposed military assistance in the bill runs to over \$6,000,000,000. But, Mr. President, I am able to identify in the bill \$2,197,000,000 for economic aid unrelated to military assistance.

I am very happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, but I did want to get those basic figures into the Record.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is exactly right.

I want the Record to show that the new projects authorized, on which we will spend about \$28,500,000 this year, are as follows:

Ice Harbor, lock and dam, in the State of Washington, \$95,899,000.

The Dalles, Oreg., lock and dam, \$326,366,000.

Old Hickory, lock and dam, in Tennessee, \$49,120,000.

Gavins Point, Nebr., \$44,900,000; making a total of \$516,285,000.

The billions do not appear in those figures at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I want to make a comparison. We have spent over \$30,000,000,000, in the past 5 years, for the assistance of nations abroad. I do not recall the exact figure, but it exceeds \$30,000,000,000. We are proposing this year to spend approximately eight and a half billion dollars. A little over \$6,000,000,000 of that is identified as military aid. But the \$2,197,000,000 is not military aid; it is for economic assistance, some of which will be spent in those countries for constructing similar projects to those contained in this bill. How many such projects there are and how much of the money will be spent for that purpose I do not know. It has been estimated by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his remarks this afternoon that we will spend about \$80,000,000,000 this year. I think it will be more than that. From what I can anticipate as a member of the Appropriations Committee, we will appropriate—of course, it will not all be spent this year—something close to \$90,000,000,000. I could be wrong about that, but the amount is somewhere between \$80,000,000,000 and \$100,000,000,000 that we shall appropriate. The \$637,000,000 in this bill for the construction of flood control, river and harbor projects, plus \$229,000,000 in the Interior Department appropriation bill for reclamation projects, makes a total of \$866,401,735 that we are appropriating this year, assuming this bill shall pass—\$866,000,000 that we are appropriating for the development of these great vital resources, for the maintenance of the projects already constructed, and for the operation of such facilities.

Let us make a comparison, Mr. President. If we appropriate around \$90,000,000,000 this year, \$866,000,000-plus is only .96 percent of the total expenditures we shall make. In other words, Mr. President, out of every dollar we shall spend this year, less than one penny of each dollar will be expended for the development of these great resources which are self-liquidating. Many of them are self-liquidating because of the power

they produce. Taking it as a whole, these projects will produce far more revenue in a reasonable period of time, say, 20 or 25 years, than the initial cost of their construction amounts to.

As to the money that we are spending abroad, Mr. President—and I am willing that some of it be spent—we have no assurance that it is making us any stronger to meet the great challenge that confronts us. I do know that when we build a power dam that will protect the valley below from floods which destroy crops, property, and industry in that valley, it is strengthening America. I know that when we build such a project and it produces 100,000 kilowatts of electricity, it is making America stronger. I know it is adding to our capital assets and to our wealth, but I do not know that the \$2,197,000,000 it is proposed we spend abroad for economic aid to other countries this year will make America one ounce stronger economically or militarily. I do know that when we spend the money here, it will make us stronger. If we spend abroad what is proposed, \$2,197,000,000, and if we spend here only what is proposed in this bill and what we have already appropriated for reclamation, a total of \$866,000,000 here at home, we shall have spent only 39 percent of what it is proposed we give away this year to foreign countries. In other words, Mr. President, we are spending more than \$2.50 to build projects of this character in foreign countries, to make them economically stronger, for every dollar we are spending at home to make America stronger by developing those natural resources that give us greater economic strength and power. So, Mr. President, we could go on. I do not have the exact figures, but based upon past appropriations we could take into account rivers and harbors and flood control; we could take into account reclamation, to which I have already referred; we could add to that soil conservation, forest preservation, Federal aid for roads. We could add them all together and they would all total less than 2 cents out of each dollar we spend.

Mr. President, we are talking about economy. I too want to economize. I do not want to resort to false economy in order to make a little showing on paper. I know the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee who are present will recall that as for my own State I wanted to stay within the budget—and we have stayed within the budget. On one project that is in the course of construction I urged that we try to go along with the House figures, and cut nearly \$1,000,000 from the budget estimate. It was at the insistence of the Corps of Engineers that we finally restored the amount, because they said that an economic loss would result to the Government if the amount were not restored, in view of the contracts that had been let for the work to be done.

Mr. President, we have tried to economize. The attitude prevailed on the part of every member of the subcommittee as it went through the appropriation bill and during the course of the hearings of trying to find every place possible where we could economize, and

economize without economic loss. Where anything could reasonably and properly be deferred we undertook to defer it. There are projects that ought not, however, be deferred. We hear it said, "Since the big flood occurred in Kansas, since the great disaster which came to that State"—and it was one of the greatest disasters in the history of the Country, Mr. President—"we should get busy and start building some projects in Kansas." I agree with that. There are, however, a dozen other places in the Nation today where similar disasters could occur by reason of the fact that we are moving so slowly with the program of developing our water resources and building those protective projects that serve to save life and prevent tremendous loss of property.

Mr. President, I just wonder how much the great disaster in Kansas and Missouri has cost the Federal Government? We have already appropriated some \$25,000,000 for relief. The Government owned a warehouse in the flooded area in which it had stored \$5,000,000 worth of property. That warehouse and its contents were completely destroyed. The facilities that were destroyed there, for which the Government had already invested its money, have to be replaced, and the cost of replacement will run into other millions of dollars.

Then, Mr. President, we must take into consideration that practically every dollar's worth of property destroyed and lost in that flood will be deductible on income-tax returns.

Mr. President, the Federal Government this year, in that one flood, has lost half of what it would have cost in Federal expenditures to have prevented the loss. Of course that does not take into account the rich topsoil that is gone forever.

There will be found in this bill an appropriation of \$4,100,000 for bank stabilization on the Arkansas River. That item came in as a late budget request. The case for the item was made so strong that even the Bureau of the Budget, after it had twice turned the request down, after additional testimony had been developed before the committee, with a representative of the Bureau of the Budget present, and after he had been urged to go back and have the Bureau of the Budget reconsider the matter, returned to the committee with a budget request for the item.

I may say, Mr. President, that I can defend before any jury or bar of economists every project that is in the appropriation bill for my State. There are many other projects that are needed and await construction. But I can say that if the money asked for is not expended for river bank stabilization in Arkansas at the points for which it is allocated and directed by the bill to be spent, a tragedy could occur, and occur soon, not to the same extent possibly that it has in the more populated areas of Missouri and Kansas where the most recent tragedy struck, but a tragedy comparable thereto can easily occur in the city of Fort Smith, Ark., where the Arkansas River, just over the Oklahoma line, is threatening to cut across to the

Poteau River. Only one-half mile separates the two streams now. The Arkansas River has already cut several miles toward the Poteau River and only a half a mile strip of land is left there between them. Disaster will be the price we shall surely pay for neglect. The bill carries funds to prevent such a disaster. I do not believe any Senator on the floor, knowing the truth about the matter, knowing the facts about the situation, would dare say that that money should be eliminated from the bill.

There are several other danger spots that require immediate attention along the Arkansas. We are appropriating for eight of them in this bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. What the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of civil functions, just said is absolutely true. It is fortunate that in the last series of hearings before the committee a strong showing was made, sufficiently strong to impress the Bureau of the Budget not only of the need for the appropriation to be made for the project in the Senator's State where it is so badly needed, but also for projects in other States.

In view of the fact that this year record floods have wrought greater devastation than ever before, I will ask the Senator from Arkansas if it is not true that it might be false economy of the worst sort for us to neglect to retain the flood control items in the bills in order that flood controls projects may be properly implemented to prevent a recurrence of the very thing the Senator is talking about in his State, something of which we have had so tragic an experience in the States of Kansas and Missouri?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator from Kansas. We would be failing in our duty and our responsibility to the American people and to the Government if we did not carry on at least a modest construction program of this character. And this is a modest program compared to need. Those who want to call it pork barreling can do so. I have heard that expression until I have begun to like it, because the truth about it is that the reflection is not on those who are charged with pork barreling, but if there is any reflection at all it is in the other direction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I headed a committee of Senators who visited the flood areas in Missouri and Kansas some 2 weeks ago. Speaking of pork as such, I will say—and the Senator from Kansas can verify my statement—that in the stockyards of Kansas City, Kans., there were 50,000 tons of pork, actual pork, in carload lots—not one carload or three carloads, but hundreds of carloads—pork which had already been processed and on the way to market which the flood scattered all over the stockyards of

Kansas City, Kans., and destroyed. That was real pork.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is very well to have a pork barrel if we have pork in it. It is nice to have some pork. But we will have an empty barrel if we fail to do what is necessary to prevent such flood disasters as have been experienced this year. The floods have washed away much of our topsoil. The floods have come in torrent's down the valleys, destroying life and property. The floods empty the barrel.

I maintain that every one of these projects is actually self-liquidating. When we construct projects which are self-liquidating, as certain communities or valleys are protected greater investments are made in them, more wealth is produced, and greater revenue comes into the Treasury. While it is an indirect process, every one of these projects is actually self-liquidating.

Someone sent me in a letter a few days ago what are said to be excerpts from a speech by Mayor William B. Hartsfield, to the Upper Chattahoochee Development Association, at Gainesville, Ga., on June 17, 1951. I should like to read these excerpts into the RECORD:

As always, when river and water power developments come before Congress, the ugly term of "pork barrel" appears in the public prints. This term, according to the Dictionary of American English was first used in 1801 to designate barrels of salt pork kept in pioneer general stores in the New England States. In 1879 the term appeared in congressional debate likening Federal appropriations for post offices and local improvements to the local pork barrels in which everybody participated. The term "pork barrel" is now designated by the Dictionary of American English as "Federal appropriations made for local improvements designed to ingratiate Congressmen with their constituents."

Further tracing of this uncomplimentary and opprobrious term as applied, for some reason, solely to Federal waterway and water power developments, develops the fact that it was often used by the reactionary papers of the Northeast, largely dominated by great railroad and power trusts who, in the past, did not want to see the people develop their own natural resources. The fastening of this ugly name to the development of the Nation's natural resources was a stroke of genius on the part of those enemies of the people in those days who saw in the term "pork barrel" a way to inflame the people against the development of their own resources.

He concludes by expressing his own opinion. He says:

We, too, advocate economy in Government and an end to unnecessary waste, but let us not end the development of our own national wealth of soil and water, under the false and misleading slander of pork-barrel appropriations.

Mr. President, I have talked longer than I intended. I had in mind at the outset discussing some of the projects in my State. I shall do so in one general statement. There is not a project in the bill for the State of Arkansas for which I would not vote or which I would not support had it been in any other State. This is not a sectional matter. I am ready to defend those projects, as I am ready to defend others in the bill, against any assault which may be made against them. I know that they are meritorious.

I know that the Government has an obligation with respect to some of them. I know that to defer them would be unwise. I know that when they are constructed they are going to serve to strengthen our national economy. Their cost is small, while the need is great; and, notwithstanding the pressure for economy, in my humble judgment, it could easily be false economy from which our Government and our people would sustain substantial losses if those projects were not constructed and this money were not expended for the development of the protective works which are needed.

EDUCATIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICES OF TELEVISION

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, on May 31 the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and I introduced a bill (S. 1579) to establish a National Citizens' Advisory Board on Radio and Television. A few days later we introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) relating to television frequency assignments, construction of new stations, and television programing.

In the weeks that have elapsed since then two things have happened which affect these measures. One of them, the less important of the two, is that the sponsors have learned more about the complex problems of the revolution that is taking place in the field of broadcasting. The other is the fact that the urgency of the problems and opportunities created by this revolution has become even more apparent; this is television's summer of decision.

As a consequence, the four sponsors of the bill and resolution have revised and modified the language of these measures, and I herewith submit them on behalf of the other three sponsors and myself in their new form. We ask that the Interstate Commerce Committee regard them as substitutes for our earlier drafts.

The joint resolution is modified in one important particular, by the removal of section 1. Section 1 called for an extension of the existing freeze on the award of new television station licenses for a period of from 6 months to 1 year in order to assure more time for exploration by parties whose interest in television would serve the public good, and in order to guard against decisions by default. The chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Coy, has pointed out that even under existing procedures it is unlikely that any new stations will be on the air before Labor Day of 1952. He made the statement about a month ago in a hearing which was presided over by our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

A further extension of the freeze would create the risk that no new stations could go on the air before 1953. In view of the fact that a third of the Nation's population now gets no home television service at all, and a substantial proportion of the rest gets only one choice, or perhaps two choices of programs; and in view of the mounting public pressure for more even if not better

service—we have withdrawn our request for extension of the freeze. The remainder of the resolution stands as before.

Second, the bill to create a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television has undergone a number of textual modifications. All of these revisions are directed toward a single end: to make it even more clear that the proposed citizens advisory board is advisory only, and further to make it clear that the board's functions do not conflict with or in any way supersede the statutory powers vested by the Congress in the Federal Communications Commission.

With these changes, I have much more than a hope that the resolution and the bill will be acceptable to the members of the FCC. In fact we have had drafting assistance from an able counsel who was until recently a prominent member of the FCC staff. He tells me that the proposed board can do an important job which the FCC never has undertaken and never could undertake in view of the pressures on it. Mr. Wayne Coy, the able chairman of the FCC, has personally approved the new draft of the bill, though he makes it clear that he does not speak for other members of the Commission.

Mr. President, the sponsors of this bill and this resolution believe that television opens for the American people the widest avenue to popular enlightenment the world has yet seen. Within the coming weeks and months, and over the next year or two, the basic pattern of TV will be set for decades to come. Will TV become an avenue to popular enlightenment or an Atlantic City boardwalk? The Congress cannot avoid or deny all responsibility for this choice. The most articulate pressures on the Congress came from those who, on their past record, are likely to lead us on the road to trivialization. There is no listener or viewers lobby in Washington to exert any counterpressure against trivialization.

The proposed National Citizens Advisory Board, as this bill envisages it, would be composed of 11 outstanding private citizens, drawn from the fields of education and communications and from among leaders in the civic, cultural, and religious life of the Nation, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In an annual report to Congress, to the Federal Communications Commission and to the public, the Board would review how radio and television are serving the public interest, or are failing to serve it. This annual report would point up broadcasting's successes and failures. Most importantly, it would suggest how radio and TV could learn better to serve the public interest.

The power to grant and withhold licenses must of course remain untrammelled in the Federal Communications Commission. However, the FCC has neither the time nor the authority actively to seek out, or to help marshal or crystallize public opinion. Nor does it claim to have competence in education. During its existence it has brought out only one general critique of broadcasting, the famed Blue Book of 1946, which, though it was mild enough, stirred up great controversy.

Some argued that the bluebook was a step which could lead ultimately toward

the censorship and control by a Government agency of the substance of what is broadcast in the United States. Nobody wants censorship in the United States—including the members of the FCC—but the charges, though they were denied, illustrate the problems of a Government regulatory agency whose duties infringe in any way on the field of information. The bluebook had some good results—but they soon faded away.

Because it would be advisory only, the proposed Citizens Advisory Board would not be subject to the charge of "censorship." Yet its potency should not be underestimated. The broadcasting industry, for all the fact that it has no radio and TV consumers lobby to contend with in Washington, and has the field to itself, cannot and will not be insensitive either to praise or constructive criticism over the long pull, and to the force of articulate public opinion.

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to clear up one misunderstanding. In my earlier remarks on the floor on this subject I have hailed the action of the regents of the University of the State of New York in asking the FCC for licenses to build a network of 11 educational TV stations in that State, as one of the most dramatic evidences of what we can hope will be a trend—a trend which could open up television for the great uses of education. The broadcasting trade press has since reported that the New York regents have reduced their request from 11 stations to 3. Mr. Henry C. Fischer, counsel for the New York regents, has now written me that the press reports are untrue, and that the regents are going ahead with their plans for the full 11 stations. I again point out that under the tentative FCC allocation table only eight stations are reserved for education in the State of New York; only one is set aside for Connecticut and one for Massachusetts; and New Jersey is to get none. I use these merely as examples.

In conclusion I should like to read three or four sentences from this remarkable letter from Mr. Fischer. He points out that—

The (New York) Board of Regents is a constitutional body charged by law with the general management and supervision of all the educational work of the State, public and private, and its plan to use television in education was devised pursuant to its statutory duty to extend to the people at large increased educational opportunities and facilities and to stimulate interest therein.

Mr. President, the New York Board of Regents, according to Mr. Fischer, "has funds invested in the physical plant of the system for which it is responsible in excess of \$2,000,000,000. In the year ending June 30 approximately \$550,000,000 was spent under the direction of this board by the public school system of New York State alone, exclusive of construction funds received from bond sales and certificates of indebtedness."

Mr. President, only 6 States in the United States and only one city—New York City—have budgets greater than the sum which was spent by the New York Board of Regents for public education in New York State. I emphasize

these figures because of the repeated charges of the commercial interests in the field of television that there is no money for educational television and educational broadcasting. There is the money, when and if the understanding of the need and the opportunity develops. The New York Board of Regents has made a study of costs of construction and operation. Mr. Fischer states in his letter that—

Without anticipating the detailed information which will be supplied to the Commission, it can be stated that the cost of the physical plant of the proposed television network and its operation will be insignificant in relation to the investment in the educational system of the State and the annual cost of maintaining it.

Mr. President, it was Mr. Jacob F. Holtzmann, the chairman of the subcommittee of the New York Board of Regents which investigated television, who announced at the completion of the study that the unallocated TV frequencies are the American people's most important national asset. Further he stated that the New York Board of Regents asserted that "we have a first mortgage upon them."

Again I pay tribute to the leadership of the 13 distinguished citizens who constitute this board, as they demonstrate their leadership in their great State of New York. With time and the power of their example, I hope other States throughout the Nation will make up their minds to go and do likewise.

I now ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fischer's full letter be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCHER, WILLIS & PANZER,
Washington, D. C., August 6, 1951.
HON. WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BENTON: I have noted a good deal of confusion and misunderstanding in the press and in interested circles about the plan of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York to establish a television network as an integral part of the educational system of the State. Because of the interest you have shown in the plan, it may be helpful for me, as special counsel to the board of regents in connection with the matter, to outline the present status of its proposed educational television network, and in this fashion dissipate some of the confusion about it.

As you know, the Federal Communications Commission has tentatively reserved eight television channels in the State of New York exclusively for noncommercial educational use, located one each in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Albany, Ithaca, Binghamton, and New York City. In the location of these reserved channels, the Commission used admirable judgment, and the board of regents fully supports the Commission in this respect.

On the other hand, the board of regents has determined after study and will demonstrate to the Commission in the course of the current hearings that an educational television network adequate to tap properly the educational programming sources and to provide the benefits of educational television equitably throughout the State will require three additional channels, one each in Poughkeepsie and in the north country, and a second channel in the New York City metropolitan

area and, further, that it is feasibly within the framework of the Commission's allocation plan to provide these additional outlets. The 11 channels involved in the plan of the board of regents have been conservatively estimated to include within their coverage areas over 90 percent of the population of the State—almost 13,500,000 people.

Some of the current confusion about the plan of the board of regents stems from a recent report in Broadcasting magazine that the plan had been scaled down to involve only three channels. This report is unfortunately erroneous. The proposal of the board of regents contemplates the full use of 11 television channels and the case which will be presented to the Commission in detail will be in support of this proposal.

Some additional confusion about the plan of the board of regents seems to stem from a general lack of understanding of the unique character of the educational system of the State and the position of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York in relation to all public and private educational institutions in the State, ranging from kindergartens through universities, postgraduate schools, museums, and libraries. The board of regents is a constitutional body charged by law with the general management and supervision of all the educational work of the State, public, and private, and its plan to use television in education was devised pursuant to its statutory duty "to extend to the people at large increased educational opportunities and facilities" and "to stimulate interest therein." The board consists of 13 members; one regent is elected each year for a term of 13 years by a ballot of the two houses of the legislature meeting in joint session. Membership is honorary; members receive no compensation other than traveling expenses. The board manages the affairs of higher education in the State through the University of the State of New York. Every public and private organization of higher education, library, and museum in the State is by statute an institution of the University of the State of New York. The board manages the affairs of the public schools and all other educational work of the State through the State education department, of which it is the statutory head. The president of the University of the State of New York and the commissioner of education, Dr. Lewis A. Wilson, is the executive officer of the board of regents, is appointed by it and serves at its pleasure. The chancellor of the board of regents is John P. Myers; the special committee on television in education consists of Regent Jacob L. Holtzmann, chairman, Regent Roger W. Straus, and Vice Chancellor Edward R. Eastman.

The system of public and private education within the jurisdiction and subject to the general supervision of the board of regents in the year 1949-50 included 126 institutions of higher education with an enrollment of over 270,000, 1,189 secondary schools with an enrollment of over 615,000, 6,092 elementary schools with an enrollment of over 2,350,000, 640 libraries, 60 museums, and 140 historical societies. The funds invested in the physical plant of this system exceed \$2,000,000,000. In the year ending June 30, 1950, approximately \$550,000,000 was spent by the public-school system alone, exclusive of construction funds received from bond sales and certificates of indebtedness. In that year, the State aid for public schools amounted to approximately \$236,000,000, and the State aid for adult education amounted to about \$2,300,000.

In the light of the unique nature of this educational system, its scope, and the quality and independence of those charged with its management, much of the conjecture and confusion about the television plan of the board of regents, particularly in relation to costs and operation, is dissipated. A study

of costs of construction and operation has been made and without anticipating the detailed information which will be supplied to the Commission it can be stated that the cost of the physical plant of the proposed television network and its operation will be insignificant in relation to the investment in the education system of the State and the annual cost of maintaining it.

Further, the plan of the board of regents envisages that the programing of the television stations will be primarily the responsibility of the more than 8,000 educational institutions in the system which have almost unlimited resources for the development of worth-while educational programing designed to enrich the offerings in elementary and secondary schools, to expand adult education and to encourage the cultural interests of the people of the State. The plan envisages further the setting up of local councils made up of representatives of the colleges, universities, the private and public schools, the libraries and museums, and all other agencies that would be largely responsible for the planning of the local or area television programs, in order to insure the continuous development of programs to meet the educational needs of the area. The State education department will assist these area councils in planning State-wide programs, will arrange for kinescope recordings and motion-picture programs of interest to all sections of the State, will integrate programs to supplement the courses of study in the schools and will provide a staff to advise with and serve the local councils in the coordination of the programing of all the stations. Dr. Wilson has already held extensive conferences throughout the State with representatives of public and private educational institutions looking toward the organization of the local programing councils under the plan. The support indicated at these conferences and the general support of the press throughout the State has been gratifying.

I will be glad to give you any additional information about the matter that will be helpful to you in eliminating doubt as to the status of the plan of the board of regents.

Very truly yours,

HENRY G. FISCHER.

REPLY TO SENATOR MCCARTHY

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I should like to read a statement issued to the press last week by one of our colleagues in the Senate. I know about rule XIX, and have had personal experience with it, but I submit that it does not cover the remarks a Senator makes about himself. The remarks I am about to make apply directly to myself because they were made about me.

Mr. President, the following statement was issued to the press last Monday, a week ago today, by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]:

I am sure that Owen Lattimore and all the Alger Hisses and William Remingtons still in Government will agree with BENTON's resolution. Tonight BENTON has established himself as the hero of every Communist and crook in and out of Government.

BENTON today has performed the important service of helping the people label the administration branch of the Democratic Party as the party which stands for Government of, by, and for communism, crooks, and cronies.

I call the attention of all honest loyal Democrats to how men of little minds are destroying the once great party.

While BENTON was Assistant Secretary of State, he worked hand in glove with the Communist clique who have been so bad for America and so good for Communist Rus-

sia. The exact number that he personally brought into Government is not fully known at this time. No wonder he squeals and screams in panic as the McCarran committee starts to uncover some of them.

Lucky for this country that Connecticut's mental midget doesn't run the Senate. BENTON will learn that people of Connecticut do not like communism and crooks in Government any more than the people of Maryland like them.

The campaign in Maryland exposes the whitewash of Communists in Government. If that was wrong, then the district attorney and not the criminal should be blamed whenever the district attorney exposes graft, corruption, and dishonesty.

Mr. President, I shall not now directly comment on this statement, as such. I refused comment at the time. I expect to continue to refuse it.

Last week, on a television program, the junior Senator from Wisconsin was asked whether he intended to go into the political campaigns in other States than his own during next year's elections, and specifically whether he intended to go into Connecticut. He replied that he would go into any State where he thought he could do good. I herewith invite him to come into Connecticut again, as he did three times last fall during the campaign. The people of my State know right from wrong. They are politically literate. Further, they have strong stomachs.

Last fall the junior Senator from Wisconsin divorced himself from Maryland long enough to come into New Haven, Hartford, and Bridgeport. On those three trips he denounced my senior colleague and myself. I may say that I attribute my own victory in part to his visits to Connecticut.

When his appearance was announced for New Haven, I called on the people of New Haven to boycott the meeting and to stay away from the hall, which seats 6,000 persons. To the everlasting credit of the people of New Haven only 376 people showed up to listen to him. Furthermore, as I jestingly told the people of Connecticut the next day, 100 of those 376 people were good Democrats—I claimed they were my Democratic spies—so, I contended, that left a net audience of only 276.

By the time the junior Senator from Wisconsin got to Bridgeport, he was in a room not much larger than the corner of the Senate floor, and his audience totaled only 200 persons. I think it may interest those who have not attended these meetings to know how they are conducted. I sent my four children to that meeting, and they took six of their friends. They described the meeting in detail on their return home. Of course, I was glad to tell the State that I had privately and personally contributed 5 percent of that particular audience.

These meetings open with a couple of Marines in full uniform and with the playing of the Marine song, "The Halls of Montezuma," while the audience stands at attention. Then the audience is called upon to repeat in unison the oath of allegiance to the flag. It is against that kind of background that these meetings are held.

Mr. President, I won by only 1,102 votes, and I again suggest that it may

well be that the presence in Connecticut of the junior Senator from Wisconsin was the decisive factor.

At this point I should like to read a paragraph from an editorial appearing in last Wednesday's issue of the Hartford Courant, a staunchly Republican newspaper:

Senator McCARTHY's reply to the Benton resolution was typical. It ignored completely its factual basis, and sought to smother it in a smokescreen of name-calling. The Senate subcommittee that investigated the Maryland campaign as a byproduct indicted Senator McCARTHY for—

Mr. President, I now omit the next two lines of the editorial, in order to make sure that I am not interrupted by being called to order. I shall place the responsibility for those words wholly on the Hartford Courant, and anyone who is interested can readily look up the editorial.

The editorial then continues as follows:

Republicans on the subcommittee joined their Democratic colleagues in condemning this. But not one word about their unanimous report appears in Senator McCARTHY's reply—perhaps because there was nothing he could say in defense of what he had done. Instead he sought to distract attention by calling Senator BENTON "Connecticut's mental midget," adding that he had "established himself as the hero of every Communist and crook in and out of Government."

Mr. President, now I should like to read a paragraph from an editorial appearing in the Sunday issue of the Bridgeport Herald. I read these editorials in order further to show not only how the people of my State reacted during the election campaign last fall, but also how they react right now.

Mr. President, I hope these two illustrations may give some of my colleagues greater courage in facing up to this issue, which is one of the most important issues of our time. The Bridgeport Herald said:

The effect of our Senator WILLIAM BENTON's demand that Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY resign or be expelled from the Senate, is to bring to public attention a report on "Red-eye" Joe's activities that might otherwise have gone unnoticed.

Had not BENTON cited the report by an investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Rules, few would have become aware that McCARTHY was sharply censured for his part in winning the 1950 senatorial election in Maryland for newcomer JOHN M. BUTLER."

These are the first two Connecticut editorials I have seen regarding my resolution calling for the expulsion of the junior Senator from Wisconsin from the Senate. I submit the full text for the RECORD, subject to such deletions as those who edit the RECORD think may be suitable in line with the rules which prevail in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of August 8, 1951]

THE CURE FOR MCCARTHYISM

As noted elsewhere in these columns today, Senator BENTON is way off base in wanting to liquidate football at West Point and Annapolis. But he was right on base in his

proposal, made the same day, that Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, resign or be investigated with a view to expelling him from the Senate.

As Senator BENTON remarked, there is little in Senator McCARTHY's record to indicate he will resign. And this despite formal disclosure of his part in the dirty work in the 1950 Butler-Tydings campaign in Maryland. Nor, unhappily, is there much in the long history of the Senate to arouse hope that Senator McCARTHY will even be investigated, let alone expelled. Most likely Senator BENTON's resolution will just gather dust in the files of the Rules Committee. But that does not change the fact that political life in this country would be healthier were Mr. McCARTHY to leave it. The moral swamp on the administration side in Washington is smelly enough, without the different but equally unclean political morals of Wisconsin's junior Senator on the Republican side.

Senator McCARTHY's reply to the Benton resolution was typical. It ignored completely its factual basis, and sought to smother it in a smokescreen of name calling. The Senate subcommittee that investigated the Maryland campaign as a byproduct indicted Senator McCARTHY for his dirty work, which included plain lying through a deliberately faked photograph. Republicans on the subcommittee joined their Democratic colleagues in condemning this. But not one word about their unanimous report appears in Senator McCARTHY's reply—perhaps because there was nothing he could say in defense of what he had done. Instead he sought to distract attention by calling Senator BENTON "Connecticut's mental midget," adding that he had "established himself as a hero of every Communist and crook in and out of Government."

This is remarkably similar to a Soviet propaganda technique, as happened to be demonstrated on the same day. A month ago President Truman sent to Nikolai Shvernik, nominal head of the Soviet Union, the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution of friendship for the Russian people, asking that it be passed on to them. Not until Monday did Moscow reply. And only thereafter were the American statements published—together with a phony peace proposal, hatched in secret in the Kremlin to smother what this country had to say to the Russian people.

There does remain one slow but sure way to take care of Senator McCARTHY. The remedy lies in the hands of Wisconsin's people, who sent him to the Senate in 1946 before he had demonstrated his habit of mixing falsehood with truth and passing them off as one and the same thing. When he runs for reelection in the fall of 1952, they can return him to the obscurity whence he came.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Herald]

BENTON VERSUS MCCARTHY

The effect of our Senator WILLIAM BENTON's demand that Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY resign or be expelled from the Senate, is to bring to public attention a report on "Red-eye" Joe's activities that might otherwise have gone unnoticed.

Had not BENTON cited the report by an investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Rules, few would have become aware that McCARTHY was sharply censured for his part in winning the 1950 senatorial election in Maryland for newcomer JOHN M. BUTLER.

Without the Connecticut Senator's action, the subcommittee's report might well have been kicked around until it got lost. It has not yet been accepted either by the full committee, of which Senator BENTON is a member, or by the Senate.

A full investigation of McCARTHY and the smears and sneers he uses in his capacity as GOP hatchet man, has long been overdue. He should not be allowed to use the protec-

tion of Senatorial immunity to slander, abuse, and vilify.

Senator BENTON got only a modified McCARTHY treatment during last fall's campaign. He now has laid himself open to the works.

But somebody had to boldly initiate the distasteful job of putting McCARTHY in his place, which is certainly not in the United States Senate. We are glad that Senator BENTON started it, and hope the rest of the Senate has the courage to finish it.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I think the Senate will be interested in my mail on this resolution of mine. Last year, when I took the floor in my distress over the reckless charges of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, in my first speech on the floor of the Senate, I said that, whether he realized it or not, consciously or unconsciously, he adopted and followed the techniques of the Soviet propagandists, with which I am so familiar; because I was responsible for studying them. Yes, I devoted almost 3 years to studying the terrifying tactics and techniques of the Soviet propagandists. In that first speech of almost 18 months ago, I used the phrase "hit and run propagandist," and suggested that, whether he knew it or not, the junior Senator from Wisconsin was a "hit and run propagandist" of the Soviet type. I pointed out that he hits and he runs, and he does not answer, he does not face up to the charges.

Mr. President, from this statement, he issued about me you would think the Maryland report was written about me. You would think that it was I who was the central figure in the indictment in the Maryland report.

My mail at the time of this first speech ran 8, 9 or 10 to 1 critical of my statements about the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Today my mail is running very very differently. I have received roughly 400 letters of congratulations, the most laudatory letters I have ever received in my 51 years of life; and I do not deserve them. I may say, even though I welcome them and thank these 400 people who have written me such enthusiastic letters. I have only received 270 letters of censure, many of them unsigned, including scores of postcards bearing no signature—crank letters, the kind of letters with which all of us are familiar. Of this 270, almost 100 are unsigned postcards. I have even had the unique experience, for me at least, of receiving an unsolicited contribution, in one of the letters, a \$5 bill.

Mr. President, I submit this brief report today as a follow up on the resolution which I submitted to the Senate a week ago today, and as a preliminary to the report which this body will receive from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I think, within the next week. The committee, last Wednesday, voted to submit the report of the subcommittee on the Maryland campaign after a 10-day delay.

AMERICA'S HOUR OF DECISION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the future of America is today being debated throughout the land. The question is whether we shall have substantially more military power than the programs now planned for this fiscal year. The

fate of the Nation may well rest upon the wisdom of our decision, and it is not an easy decision. On the one hand, we have to guard against a growing inflation in our country, and on the other hand, to build military power that can surely protect us against a growing threat to our existence.

Hearings in the subcommittee on the Armed Services of the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, have not yet been completed on the military appropriations proposed for the current fiscal year. Yet we have valid data which show that the Russians may outstrip our military power unless we increase our efforts. Meanwhile, the cost of our Armed Forces, already great, is increasing every day.

There is no question about the value and necessity for all the armed services in any war we may have to fight, but there is also no escaping the fact that air power is the challenging problem. Russian armies, as serious a threat as they may be to our allies and to world peace, are a long distance from our shores, and the main capability of our allies is to produce ground power. The Russian Navy can scarcely be considered a major threat against us, because the United States Navy is roughly as large as the combined fleets of the rest of the world—including our allies. It is not open to argument that the Russian Army or the Russian Navy could not by any surprise attack stop or greatly delay the slow but sure build-up of our military forces.

But the Russian Air Force could do all of these things. It is only a few hours away, no matter what we do, and armed with the atomic bombs the Russians possess, could do us terrible damage in a few hours. It could take the lives of many thousands of our citizens, and it could disrupt our whole armament program. It may be able to do these things despite the best we can do in the way of air defense during the next few years.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator made the statement that the Russian Air Force using atomic missiles, might take the lives of many thousands of our citizens. I am sure the Senator realizes they might take the lives of untold millions of our citizens.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, it seems entirely probable to the junior Senator from Louisiana that the losses in one or two days conceivably could be more than we have lost in an entire world war.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct.

It is simply beyond human comprehension to foretell the number of American people who might be killed, and the damage which might be wrought in this country, if the Russians made up their

minds to proceed with a surprise attack, and, as we might express it in common parlance, to throw at us everything they possessed in the way of air power. I wish to thank the Senator for his contribution.

Our Air Force can not promise to halt fully a determined Russian air attack, and certainly our Army and Navy, brave as they are, can do little to protect us from a growing number of long-range Russian planes and atomic bombs. Neither can our Army and Navy strike back effectively or readily against the sources of Russian power deep within the land mass of Eurasia.

Fortunately for us, we now have superiority in the weapon which threatens us most. We have reason to believe that our superiority in atomic bombs will enable us to strike a counter-blow that would more than offset any surprise atomic attack against us. The evidence indicates that this fact, and our potential enemy's knowledge of it, has saved the world from a major war up to now.

But every month our margin of superiority in long-range air power decreases, as Russian air strength is relentlessly built up. If this trend continues, there is great danger that, like the dictators of the past, Stalin will move to exploit Russian air superiority and will attack us in the belief that he can overwhelm us in the air by combining force and surprise. Already there is evidence that the Russian despots are beginning to believe in their ability to destroy us in the air. They have emphasized their air build-up for several years and they have achieved almost incredible progress.

Even if they should be overoptimistic and mistaken about the quality of their superior numbers of pilots and aircraft, the greatest tragedy of history might result from their mistake. We want our ability to retaliate to be so demonstrable and unmistakable that it will not be challenged.

Whatever may be the size or composition of the force we need to do this, there is no denying that we must have it, and to me it is only logical that the size of our forces must bear a direct relationship to the size of the Russian forces. Most certainly it is not a partisan question and it must not become a partisan matter. I have been emphasizing the importance of air power for many years, and I have never considered my efforts as a party issue. I have been supported by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the chairman of the subcommittee, which includes the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who just made a fine contribution in connection with my remarks, and also some distinguished members of the Republican Party. Emphatically, this is not a matter of inter-service jealousy, and it must not be decided on the basis of service prestige.

It is because I deplore any tendency to twist the question "What constitutes adequate air power?" into a party battle or a service battle that I desire to invite attention to an article in the New York Times of July 29 by Mr. Hanson Baldwin, and ask that the article be printed in

the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Mr. Baldwin is a graduate of Annapolis and a well-known commentator on military matters.

The balanced-force theory about which he writes fails to take into account the known strengths and weaknesses of our potential enemy, and this failure will surely result in our being overly strong in some departments and weak in others. We are faced by a reasonably well known situation today, one for which we can prepare. Wars have been won by armies in past history, and wars have been won by navies in the past, as well as by both those services combined. There is no reason to assume that a war cannot be won by air power, and if war is forced upon us by Russia, under present circumstances and conditions, that is the way we will have to win it. We certainly can not sail a navy into Russia nor can we march an army there.

Korea has demonstrated the decisiveness of air power, as well as its limitations. Despite the fact that our airmen were not permitted to attack some of the prime targets of airpower—the sources of the supplies and equipment used in that war and the points where most of the soldiers were mobilized, trained and equipped—it has been proved that our land-based and sea-based air power largely compensated for inferiority in numbers of men on the ground. To condemn a weapon as limited because its full use was prohibited is not logical.

Neither the Korean war, nor any other war, has tested the merits of intercontinental bombing, and it is opinion—not argument—to say that the concept is fallacious. The B-36, which has never been bought in great numbers although it has proved its intercontinental capabilities many times, is not a failure. Like all airplanes which have been in existence for several years, it can now be superseded by faster and more effective bombers designed to do the same job.

It is entirely possible that Russian strength, naval, ground and air, has been exaggerated in the press. The figures, however, which have been quoted are derived from many intelligence agencies, including those of other Nations. They present a very sobering picture. Arguments that we are concealing our own air strength, or hiding a number of groups somewhere, serve only to mislead and confuse.

It is true, as Mr. Baldwin says, that we must consider the effect on our economy of any substantial increase in our air power. I will add that we must consider not only the effect of our air power on our economy, but of our presently balanced—rather equalized—investment in the Army and Navy. And we must put first things first.

As I see the picture, Mr. President, after many years of hearing testimony before various committees, the first thing at this moment, under present circumstances, is air power.

EXHIBIT 1

HOW BIG AN AIR FORCE—ARGUMENT IS RE- OPENED—CASE FOR AND AGAINST THE 150- GROUP PROGRAM WEIGHED BY THE PENTAGON (By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Air power, newest of the military arms, became again last week the center of controversy in Washington as a major expansion of the Air Force was projected.

Two speeches—one by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts, the other by Earle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion, describing the United States as a "second rate air power" and urging an expansion of the Air Force by considerably more than 50 percent—have been accompanied by a spate of articles and statements urging similar expansion.

Both President Truman and Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, following the opening of what some observers believed was a planned campaign for air expansion, declared that an increase in the military budget was being studied but that studies of costs—and of purposes for which more dollars would be requested—would not be completed until the fall.

The proposals for Air Force expansion are becoming a highly controversial interservice issue, and also may become a political and economic issue. For the suggested increases imply priority for the Air Force in dollars and manpower at the expense of the balanced-forces principle and also imply concentration upon the strategy of victory through air power, which the Army and Navy reject. Factors of service prestige are also important.

ECONOMIC QUESTION

So far, the economic issue involved in the Air Force expansion program is secondary; indeed, no such issue may really develop if the dimensions of the program are plainly within financial reach without too great an increase in taxes, or without injury to the economic well-being of the Nation. But the early arguments in favor of the Air Force expansion program advocated the ending of the "guns-and-butter" period of military expansion, the elimination of the butter and an increase in the guns. Such an economic philosophy might also have obvious political overtones with a presidential election in the offing.

These then are the potential dimensions of a controversy which has not, as yet, been accurately defined, largely because nearly all of the expansion proposals so far published have been unofficial and the administration has not committed itself. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been studying the issue intermittently and between now and November they must formulate military-budget requests for the 1953 fiscal year.

The expansion proposals, insofar as they can now be defined, envisage an Air Force of from about 138 to 150 combat groups, which would number from 18 to 75 planes each (with the men to fly and maintain them). Today, the Air Force is expanding toward a 95-group goal, 15 of which, Senator Lodge claimed (but others dispute), are air transport and troop-carrier groups.

National Guard and Reserve air groups prior to Korea totaled 61 additional air groups, but 14 of these had been ordered into Federal service by last February, and 33 others were then scheduled for call. The present program, which was to reach its 95-group goal next July 1, is only partly completed; the approximate strength of the Air Force today is given as about 87 groups as compared to 59 incomplete groups on December 1, 1948.

BUDGET MATTERS

The cost of this 150-group Air Force by Senator Lodge's calculations, which are disputed by the Pentagon, would be \$10,000,-

000,000 more than has actually been requested for the Air Force for the current fiscal year, and a total cost of \$96,000,000,000 for the Air Force for 3 years. The expansion of manpower would involve an increase from the present 737,000 officers and men in the Air Force beyond the 95-group goal of 1,061,000 (to be reached by July 1, 1952) to an eventual 1,800,000.

The proposals being formulated in the Pentagon differ—in some respects widely—from Senator Lodge's proposals, and they have not yet been accurately "price-tagged." One plan suggested in official circles, however, is for a 138-combat-group Air Force (plus transport groups). Such an Air Force might imply a \$70,000,000,000 annual defense budget, with the big slice of the pie—perhaps \$40,000,000,000—going to the Air Force, and the remainder divided between an Army and Navy which would be strictly limited or perhaps even reduced in size.

These figures compare with a total military budget of about \$48,000,000,000 in the past fiscal year and more than \$60,000,000,000 requested for the current fiscal year. Of this latter total the Army and Air Force have requested appropriations of more than \$20,000,000,000 each, the Navy more than \$15,000,000,000, plus additional billions for each service for supplemental and military-works programs.

The new program would obviously involve, therefore, a major change in the percentage allotment of the defense dollar to the services, and might involve actual reductions in the size of the Army and Navy.

The principal arguments that are advanced for the projected program are:

1. Air power is the "point of the spear," as Senator Lodge put it. " * * * No ground force can win against hostile tactical air superiority unless it is prepared to mass tremendous weight of numbers and accept fantastic casualties." Air power, in other words, is the most important arm in war today and could conceivably—with the aid of the atom bomb—achieve victory through air power without the utilization of tremendous land armies.

2. The ground forces being built up in Europe by General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower must have heavy tactical air support, a major portion of which must come from the United States. Without such air support there is no use raising the ground divisions.

SOVIET PRESSURE

3. Russian progress in atomic and long-range bomber development makes imperative a stronger United States air defense.

4. The weakness of the Convair B-36 program—with few of these intercontinental planes available—necessitates a sharp expansion of our strategic jet medium bombers, and the appropriation of funds to produce the Boeing B-52, a giant jet replacement for the B-36.

5. Obvious Russian progress in the air has pushed the United States into second place in certain types of airpower and threatens our lead in other types; in other words, we are being outstripped in the air-armaments race.

The arguments against the proposals are:

1. No one service can win a war alone, and the proposed expansion program would end the "team" concept of "balanced forces" and would strengthen the Air Force at the expense of the other services to such an extent as to endanger our military effectiveness and our present strategic concepts. It would encourage an Air Force "go-it-alone" philosophy and emphasis on an "easy war" strategy, which is fundamentally fallacious, but, in an election year, politically appealing.

2. Korea has demonstrated the limitations of air power. Observers point to World War II—specifically to Rommel, inferior on the ground and in the air—and to Korea to refute Senator Lodge's assertion that ground

forces without air superiority cannot win. No mass air superiority will stop Russian divisions from overrunning Western Europe, unless United Nations ground divisions are available in sufficient strength.

FALSE CONCEPT

3. The intercontinental bombing concept is today fallacious and the bulk of Air Force funds should be put not into a big bomber program but into tactical air power and medium-speed bombers.

4. Russian air strength is being deliberately exaggerated in order to secure support for the proposed expansion program. Our own air strength is similarly being minimized; for instance, it is alleged the Air Force today actually has more than 100 groups, instead of 87, and the comparisons of United States and Russian air strength usually omit our naval aviation, strongest in the world.

5. Adding billions to the defense budget for an indefinite period might weaken our economy and play into Stalin's hands.

Some increase in Air Force strength seems likely, but the immediate goal will probably not be—unless world war III appears imminent—as large as the 150 groups urged by Senator Lodge.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 684) to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952, and it was signed by the Vice President.

IMPRISONMENT OF ASSOCIATED PRESS CORRESPONDENT WILLIAM OATIS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have an article which I think is of sufficient importance to be read into the Record at this time. It is written by Ray Brock, special correspondent, now in Turkey, and reads as follows:

ISTANBUL, TURKEY.—Poor Bill Oatis is getting the full treatment from the brutal, cunning Russian MVD in the characteristic Communist methods of endless inquisitions, near-starvation, solitary confinement, drugs, beatings, and more inquisitions, under the blinding floodlights of the Soviet inquisitors.

I should have explained, Mr. President, that Mr. Brock has been a foreign correspondent a great many years. He covered the Spanish-American War and World War II in France and in the Balkans. He is now in Turkey covering some of the current events there. The letter continues:

While State Secretary Acheson evades and parries questions about the Associated Press chief in Prague—and while the White House and Congressmen issue pious, futile denunciations of the torture and imprisonment of an American newspaperman following his

Communist drumhead trial—William N. Oatis is undergoing literal hell in a four-by-four cell in Prague.

A Slovak underground agent, a former assistant military attaché in a nearby Balkan capital, slipped into Turkey with first-hand information on Oatis' confinement, his condition, and positive assurances that Oatis will be dead of malnutrition, shock, and sheer brutalization, unless he is sprung from his vile prison cell within a matter of weeks. The Soviet Press may then be expected to issue the usual communique that Oatis was killed while trying to escape or that he died of some vague disease.

Gunboat diplomacy is perhaps out of date; and even the British sat out the sentences and imprisonments of a group of British engineers who were hurled into the notorious Lubianka prison in Moscow in 1933 for alleged sabotage. But the case of William N. Oatis is an outrage meriting something more than the platitudes of Dean Gooderham Acheson. The impotence of the American State Department, the United States Congress, and the President, himself, to do anything—even to communicate with Oatis—is typical of the low prestige, influence, and power of the west in Central Europe, the Balkans, and Middle East today.

Bill Oatis has been sentenced to 10 years of the vilest imprisonment, with the attendant tortures, privations, inquisitions peculiar to Soviet methods, for having done nothing more than perform the routine duties of an American foreign correspondent. According to my Slovak informant, Oatis is being subjected to day and night, around the clock, inquisition. He is denied anything but a slim bread ration and gruel—enough to keep him, temporarily, alive—and is subjected to beatings, druggings, and sleepless hours of repetitious questioning designed to break his will, his morale, his health, and elicit the usual "confession" of espionage, sabotage, and acts against the Czech Communist Government and the Soviet Union.

This correspondent is personally familiar with the efforts and intervention of Secretary Acheson on behalf of another celebrated political prisoner—and, as far as I am concerned, I'd rather be dead. The previous prisoner was Gen. Draja Mihailovich, Commander in Chief of the Serbian Chetniks, who, callously abandoned by the OWI, the OSS, and the misinformed western press as an Axis "collaborationist," was run down, ultimately, by Tito's Communist partisans. Half dead of typhus, ravaged by the hunger and privation of his years of guerrilla warfare against the Germans, Italians, the Croatian Fascist Ustashi, Mihailovich was subjected to intolerable tortures, drugged, beaten to insensibility, revived, and tried before a Communist court in Belgrade. The Serbian general then confessed, almost inaudibly, to alleged "accommodation with"—Winston Churchill's phrase—the Axis enemy. Mihailovich was taken to the subbasement of a Belgrade prison and riddled with sub-machine-gun fire—riddled so as to make the body unrecognizable. Then the mangled corpse was tossed into a hidden grave to prevent Serb Loyalists from retrieving it for honorable burial.

Before and during the trial of Draja Mihailovich this correspondent headed a mission to Washington to intervene on the general's behalf with the State Department and the President. This mission included on its roster such responsible and liberal figures as Dorothy Thompson, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, international journalists of undisputed renown—Christopher Emmet, a recognized free-rights crusading journalist; David Martin, journalist, writer, and author of *Ally Betrayed*, a documented history of Mihailovich's campaign; and 37 United States wartime pilots, bombardiers, navigators, and gunners who had parachuted into

Mihailovich-held Yugoslav territory, had been saved, protected, and repatriated to the Allied lines. The fliers chartered a plane to Chicago, foregathered from their scattered home cities, and flew to Washington to join me. We approached the State Department and the White House for a hearing, with affidavits from all the fliers who, parachuting from disabled bombers into Mihailovich territory, had eye witnessed his campaign against the Axis enemy, and who had been flown out to Allied air bases in Italy from a clandestine field constructed by the Chetniks.

But the pro-Soviet influence was still in the ascendancy in official Washington in the early summer of 1946. Acting Secretary Acheson, counseled by Alger Hiss, flatly refused to see the fliers or any members of the Mihailovich mission. The worried President was advised by Hiss to give the American airmen the brush-off. He did so. This correspondent, at a Presidential press conference, was told that the President had turned the matter over to his military aide (General Vaughan) and that was as far as it would go. It went further, however.

Warned by the then near eastern desk chief of the State Department, Wallace Barbour, that the American airmen were preparing to make a public statement on the issue, Dean Acheson relented. He agreed to a 5-minute conference. The head of the fliers' delegation, David Martin, and I, stayed 45. We laid the affidavits before Acheson. We pointed out, with documents and unimpeachable proof, that Mihailovich stood in peril of political murder for nothing more than defense of his homeland—on orders from the Yugoslav Government-in-exile in, first, Cairo, then London—against the Axis and later Communist depredations by the pillaging Partisans of the Communist terrorist Tito. Acheson, then as now, was aware that the State Department, the OWI and OSS, were honeycombed with Communist and pro-Soviet employees.

Dean Gooderham Acheson, at the end of the 45-minute conference, firmly assured this correspondent, David Martin, and the designate-head of the United States airmen's mission that "everything possible will be done to insure that General Mihailovich will be liberated."

Mihailovich was machine-gunned to death, after his mock trial, a scant few weeks later. Research discloses that the extent of Acheson's intervention was a weakly worded aide memoire—very similar to the notes relating to the fate of William N. Oatis.

Much more than the fate of William N. Oatis is at stake presently, although the life of a working foreign correspondent should be enough to stir the State Department to action. The sworn affidavits of 37 United States airmen, representing more than 600 allied fliers, Americans, Scots, British, and Australians, attesting Mihailovich's loyalty, fell on completely deaf ears at the State Department, then located in the architectural monstrosity on Pennsylvania, now in "Foggy Bottom."

Despite the eloquent appeals and outraged editorials of leading American newspapers, the State Department and the White House have apparently done nothing but issue routine protests and threats of futile economic sanctions against, of all people, the Czechs.

William N. Oatis, Associated Press Correspondent, is a tortured prisoner of the Soviet Union. Seized by the MVD, tortured by their skilled and brutal agents, flung into solitary, beaten, drugged, and forced to a typical Soviet "confession"—this American citizen and newspaperman is nearing exhaustion and death today in a prison cell in Communist Czechoslovakia.

This correspondent is, admittedly, no Tom Paine. But we could use a Tom Paine right now, if we had one.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PUBLIC HEALTH HEALTH SERVICE—CONFIRMATIONS OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of nominations in the Public Health Service on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 14, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 13 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Frank G. Serrao, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Oren Ethelbert Long.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Charles S. Duncombe, of New Jersey, to the position of Examiner in Chief on the Board of Appeals of the United States Patent Office.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

William A. Mayberry	Richard M. Dillon
Francis L. Brittan	John W. Yager
Philip A. Hogue	Norman W. Bouchard
Eugene Carlson, Jr.	Gerard J. Perron
Paul R. Happel	Elliot S. Shafer
Edric S. Bates	

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Andrew F. Nixon	Francis H. Achard, Jr.
Forrest E. Stewart	Donald L. Savary, Jr.
William F. Maki	

The following-named person to be a chief boatswain in the United States Coast Guard:

Richard E. Walker

The following-named person to be a chief radio electrician in the United States Coast Guard:

George W. Rickles

The following-named persons to be chief machinists in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert J. Collins
Jessie S. Cockrell

The following-named person to be a chief pay clerk in the United States Coast Guard:
William E. Sparks

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton 2d, O154541, United States Army Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Charles Edward Hart, O15788, United States Army.
Brig. Gen. Riley Finley Ennis, O11854, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15068, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. Thomas Leonard Harrold, O16051, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180, United States Army.
Col. Herbert Maury Jones, O12251, United States Army.
Col. Alfred Eugene Kastner, O14932, United States Army.
Col. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, O14966, United States Army.
Col. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634, United States Army.
Col. Marcus Butler Stokes, Jr., O15613, United States Army.
Col. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Earle Standlee, O16530, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).
Brig. Gen. William Edward Shambora, O16540, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Don Longfellow, O16708, Medical Corps, United States Army.
Col. Martin Eugene Griffin, O16537, Medical Corps, United States Army.
Col. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546, Medical Corps, United States Army.
Col. James Ogilvie Gillespie, O16711, Medical Corps, United States Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Col. Neal Anthony Harper, O4025, Dental Corps, United States Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 13 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

Wilton L. Halverson

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

James J. Callaway	Elaine A. Schwinge
Seymour Levine	Ernest J. Carlson
Francis T. Flood	William M. Lordi
William P. Galen	James F. Alexander
Gerald W. Labiner	Sherman N. Kieffer
Ernest C. Siegfried	Charles S. McCammon
Nicholas L. Petrakis	Robert A. Mayer
Robert Schwartz	Rodrique A. Gravelle
John S. Shuttleworth	Sidney J. Curran
Cleve B. Vaughan, Jr.	Eugene J. VanScott
Page H. Seekford	Charles J. Cherre
John D. Talbert	Vincent J. DePaulo

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

David C. Miller	Margaret S. Spies
Allan B. Carter	Leonard A. Lewis
Frank L. Weaver, Jr.	Cameron L. Self
Clyton R. Haberman	Donald W. Tharp
Warren H. Proudfoot	Bernard G. Keizer
David J. Crosby	Gordon F. Wise
Melvin R. Davis	

To be senior assistant sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Harold Lyons

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever blessed God, we thank Thee for this moment of prayer set apart for communion with the great Companion of our souls and the Counselor of our minds.

May we always feel the presence and power of Thy divine spirit, and begin each new day with the prayer, "What wilt Thou have me be and do?"

Grant that we may be inspired to give our best for the most helpful and noblest ways of serving our country and all mankind.

Make us trustworthy and faithful, as we aspire to stand in the glorious tradition of those who sought to do justly, loved mercy, and walked humbly with the Lord.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 10, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of

the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1214. An act to authorize and direct conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Florida to the St. Augustine port, waterway, and beach district.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3973, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, STIGLER, BATES of Kentucky, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, CANNON, and WIGGLESWORTH.

SUSPENDING IMPORT DUTIES ON LEAD

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4948) to suspend certain import duties on lead.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman kindly explain the bill for the benefit of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill suspends the import duties on lead from the day following enactment of the bill until the close of March 31, 1953, or the termination of the present national emergency. The bill also contains a proviso whereby the President is required to revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of common lead delivered at New York, has been below 16½ cents per pound.

The ceiling price on domestic lead is now 17 cents per pound. Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June 1950, the demand for lead in this country and in the world at large has increased rapidly. This has resulted in a shortage of lead. The United States depends on imports of lead for about one-third of its current requirements.

While the suspension of duties on lead will still not permit United States importers to meet the world price of lead, it is believed that imports will be increased and shortages alleviated to some extent due to the desire of foreign producers to earn dollars and to create or preserve their markets in this country.

It is believed that there will continue to be a shortage of lead in this country for the duration of the suspension under this bill. However, in order to protect domestic producers in the event of unforeseen circumstances which may alleviate the present shortage, the bill contains the above-mentioned proviso requiring the President to revoke the suspension of duties.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Defense, the Treasury Department, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Economic Cooperation Administration, all support legislation which would suspend the import duties on lead.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD explaining a little further the purposes of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 4948 is to suspend the import duties on lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds, lead bullion or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, and antimonial scrap lead, which duties are imposed under paragraphs 391 and 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The suspension would apply beginning with the day following the date of enactment of the bill and ending with the close of March 31, 1953, or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier.

The bill also contains a proviso whereby the President shall revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of common lead for that month, delivered at New York, has been below 16½ cents per pound.

Since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in June 1950, the demand for lead in the United States and in the world at large has increased rapidly. As a result of this demand, domestic lead prices have risen from 11 cents per pound on June 28, 1950, to 17 cents per pound on January 1, 1951. The Economic Stabilization Agency froze the price of domestic lead at 17 cents per pound and of imported lead at 18½ cents per pound on January 26, 1951.

In 1950 consumption of lead in the United States was 1,220,000 tons, production was 429,875 tons, and 366,500 tons of lead were recovered from scrap. It is estimated by the trade that the United States mine output for 1951 will be somewhat higher than the output of 429,875 tons in 1950, and that the recovery of lead from scrap will be close to the 366,500 tons in 1950.

This country is dependent on imports of lead for approximately one-third of its current requirements. In 1950 imports amounted to 565,152 tons. Since the beginning of 1951, imports of lead have fallen considerably. During January and February imports averaged 22,000 tons per month, compared with average monthly imports of 47,000 tons

during 1950. During these same months consumption of lead continued at the same high rate attained in the last half of 1950.

In order to conserve supplies of lead for defense production, the National Production Authority issued Order M-38, on April 3, 1951, restricting consumers of lead to 100 percent of their average monthly consumption in the first 6 months of 1950, effective May 1, 1951. This order also prohibits consumers of lead from holding in inventory more than 30 days' supply of lead. Even with this order in effect, it appears that the total domestic supplies of lead, including production and imports, will be far short of domestic requirements in the immediate future.

The import duties on lead under the Tariff Act of 1930 are—

First. Two and one-eighths cents per pound on the lead content of lead bullion, base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, and antimonial lead; and

Second. One and one-half cents per pound on the lead content of lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds.

The duty on the lead content of scrap lead, antimonial scrap lead, lead dross, and reclaimed lead is 2½ cents per pound. Public Law 869, Eighty-first Congress, suspended the duties on scrap metal—including lead—from October 1, 1950, until the close of June 30, 1951. This suspension was continued to June 30, 1952, by Public Law 66, Eighty-second Congress.

Under the trade agreement with Mexico which went into effect on January 1, 1943, the rates of duty on lead were reduced 50 percent. This trade agreement was terminated on January 1, 1951, and the rates of duty reverted to the rates in the Tariff Act of 1930. Under the trade agreement with Canada which went into effect June 6, 1951—Treasury Decision 52759—the rates of duty on lead have again been reduced by 50 percent.

Although the duties on lead imported for private account were not suspended during World War II, most lead imported was entered free of duty for the account of the Government which allocated lead among domestic consumers.

In the early part of 1948, a severe shortage of lead developed and Congress suspended the import duties on lead from June 20, 1948, through June 30, 1949, by Public Law 725, Eightieth Congress. Your committee believes that again suspending the duty on lead will tend to increase imports into this country.

The price of imported lead is now frozen at 18½ cents per pound. If the duties are again suspended, foreign producers of lead could realize from three-quarters cent per pound to 1½ cents per pound more than they are now receiving on sales of foreign lead in the United States under the current price ceiling. In mid-April, the price of lead from Mexico, which is the principal source of United States imports, ranged from 19 cents to 22 cents per pound, f. a. s. Gulf ports, when sold for export to Europe. Thus, exporters of lead from Mexico

realize more on lead exported to Europe than they realize on sales to the United States.

Although the suspension of duties will still not permit United States importers to meet the world price of lead, it is believed that imports will be increased since payments in dollars for such imports to foreign producers will offset to some extent the differences in price because these producers will be anxious to earn dollars and to create or preserve markets for their products in this country.

Your committee believes that there will continue to be a shortage of lead for the duration of the suspension of duty under the bill. It has, however, in order to protect domestic producers in the event of unforeseen circumstances which may increase the supply of lead to such an extent that the shortage may be alleviated, inserted a proviso in the bill under which the President is required to revoke the suspension of duties when, for any one calendar month, the average market price of common lead delivered at New York, falls below 16½ cents per pound.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Defense, the Treasury Department, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Economic Cooperation Administration have expressed their support of legislation to suspend the import duties on lead. The Treasury Department also advised your committee that it anticipates no unusual administrative difficulties if this bill should be enacted into law. The Bureau of the Budget advised these departments and agencies that it had no objection to the submission of their reports favoring suspension of the duties on lead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the import duties imposed under paragraphs 391 and 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on lead-bearing ores, flue dust, and mattes of all kinds, lead bullion or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, and antimonial scrap lead shall not apply with respect to imports entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of the enactment of this act and ending with the close of March 31, 1953; or the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, whichever is earlier: Provided, That when, for any one calendar month during such period, the average market price of common lead for that month, in standard shapes and sizes, delivered at New York, has been below 16½ cents per pound, the Tariff Commission, within 15 days after the conclusion of such calendar month, shall so advise the President, and the President shall, by proclamation, not later than 20 days after he has been so advised by the Tariff Commission, revoke such suspension of the duties imposed under paragraphs 391 and 392 of the Tariff Act of 1930, such revocation to be effective with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after the date of such proclamation.

In determining the average market price of common lead for each calendar month

the Tariff Commission is hereby authorized to base its findings upon the average monthly price of common lead, in standard shapes and sizes, delivered at New York, reported by the Engineering and Mining Journal's Metal and Mineral Markets.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 4948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

LAPEL BUTTONS FOR NEXT OF KIN OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3911, an act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged, together with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "during" insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "II" and insert "II."

Page 2, line 15, after "during" insert "World War I."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "II" and insert "II."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "and."

Page 3, line 18, after "(e)" insert "the term 'World War I' shall include the period extending from April 6, 1917, to March 3, 1921; and (f)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the provision of these amendments?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3911 provides appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war in period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged.

The authority for issuing gold star lapel buttons for World War II is the act of August 1, 1947. H. R. 3911 reenacted much of that act, and extended the authority to receive lapel buttons to the widows and next of kin of those who lose their lives in Korea and also extends the authority to the widows and next of kin of those who lose their lives following the declaration of national emergency and before the beginning of hostilities of World War II.

There has never been any authority for the issuance of lapel buttons to widows and next of kin who lost their

lives in World War I, and the Senate amendments give this authority.

The additional cost resulting in the Senate amendments cannot be accurately estimated because there is no way of knowing how many people will apply for the lapel buttons. The cost of a button, packaging, and mailing is \$1.25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCE IN CLOTHING ALLOWANCE FOR CADETS, MIDSHIPMEN, AND CADETS IN THE COAST GUARD

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2736, an act to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 21, insert:

"Sec. 3. Section 183 of title 14 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 183. Cadets; initial clothing allowance.

"The Secretary may prescribe a sum which shall be credited to each new cadet upon first admission to the Academy, to cover the cost of his initial clothing and equipment issue, which sum shall be deducted subsequently from his pay. Each cadet discharged prior to graduation who is indebted to the United States on account of advances of pay to purchase required clothing and equipment shall be required to turn in to the Academy all clothing and equipment of a distinctively military nature to the extent required to discharge such indebtedness; and, if the value of such clothing and equipment so turned in does not cover the indebtedness incurred, then such indebtedness shall be canceled."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and the Coast Guard Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill, affecting the authority of the service academies to authorize an advance in clothing allowances for the cadets and midshipmen, has been amended to include the cadets at the Coast Guard Academy. Present law places a limitation of \$250 upon such advances and in this day and age that sum is completely inadequate. The proposed legislation would remove this limitation. This is not a gift or grant to the midshipmen or cadets, it is merely an advance against future pay and allowances.

The Committee on Armed Services has unanimously approved the amendment which would remove the present \$250 limitation imposed on such advances for Coast Guard cadets.

The only cost involved to the Government in this legislation are the sums that

cannot be collected from cadets and midshipmen who are dismissed or resign from the academies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, 1952

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 311) making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after "law", insert ": Provided, That in carrying out the provisions of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as added by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949,' approved July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78, 82d Cong.), the Secretary of Labor is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint Mexican nationals for temporary employment in Mexico for a period of not to exceed 120 days."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman should explain this matter. I understand this has been cleared with the minority members.

Mr. DENTON. That is correct.

A few days ago, we passed a resolution providing for an emergency supplemental appropriation, for the purpose of putting into operation Public Law 78, commonly known as the wetback law. But when this resolution passed the Senate, an amendment was added which permitted the Government to hire, for a period of 120 days, Mexican nationals in administering the act. The Department of Labor was anxious that this provision be inserted in the resolution. They stated that this was necessary for them to employ clerks and janitors and people in the lower-wage scale. The Department stated that there was an emergency calling for putting the act into effect immediately, and that this amendment, added by the Senate, was necessary to enable them to do so.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I have seen the amendment and given it consideration, and, as far as we are concerned on this side, I am satisfied it is for the best interests; and I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H. R. 5113

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5113.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 384) providing for the consideration of the bill (S. 349) to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense (Rept. No. 845) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 349) to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE KANSAS FLOOD TRAGEDY

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and widespread devastation caused by the unprecedented floods in Kansas have left thousands of people homeless, without jobs, and in desperate circumstances. Entire farms have been swept away, and thousands of acres of crops have been destroyed. Businessmen and large industries have been wiped out. The Kansas highway system has suffered nearly \$20,000,000 loss and damage to its bridges and highways. City after city finds itself faced with the insurmountable problem of replacing sewer systems, waterworks, highways, and streets, together with many other expenses involved in the process of digging out.

This catastrophe is a national one, proclaimed by the President to be a major disaster affecting the welfare of the entire country. The loss is not sustained just by the people of Kansas,

Missouri, and Oklahoma. Its tragic effect will be felt by the citizens of all segments of our country. The great loss sustained by our people cannot be measured in dollars. The suffering and hardships can only be imagined after seeing these courageous people bending to the task of rebuilding their homes, farms, and businesses.

This week we will vote upon appropriations for billions of dollars to aid foreign countries in rebuilding their areas devastated by war. Is it too much to ask, Mr. Speaker, that our people at home, who have suffered, be given the same consideration?

I am deeply concerned about the coming recess of the House of Representatives because I am afraid that it will delay important legislation being introduced by me and others to help rehabilitate these devastated areas. I trust that Congress will act upon these measures with speed, because the help is needed now. Delay will be a second tragedy which we here in Congress can prevent by prompt action.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the Defense Production Act of 1952, I offered an amendment to take certain strategic and critical materials out from under the ceiling. That amendment carried in the Committee of the Whole but was defeated in the House by a vote of 200 to 214.

This last week the Office of Price Stabilization issued a new regulation exempting certain strategic and critical minerals from price control. It will be remembered that in the House the reason for refusing acceptance of the amendment was that it would list these minerals; and second, that it would raise the price. The minerals are named in the notice that came out and it includes chrome, manganese, and others in the statement issued by the Office of Price Administration. It also indicates that some increase in price may be expected and that this price increase is necessary if these critical and strategic minerals are to be made available. This is the argument I made when I offered my amendment and I am glad to see it supported by DMA in the issue of this regulation. The news story follows:

SEVERAL MINOR METALS, MOST FROM ABROAD, RELEASED FROM PRICE CURBS

WASHINGTON.—The Government exempted from price controls several minor metals which come mostly from foreign sources.

The metals are raw asbestos, beryl ores, chrome ores, cobalt ores and metal, columbite-tantalum ores, natural graphite, kyanite and related ores, manganese ores, domestic mercury and acid grade fluorspar. The exemption was effective yesterday under provisions of amendment 4 to General Overriding Regulation 9.

The Office of Price Stabilization said the exemption was made because these are crit-

ical and strategic materials which are in short supply. Exemption was considered necessary to avoid any interference with the flow of supplies to this country, OPS said.

The agency admitted the exemption will increase costs for domestic consumers but said that the increase will have a much less damaging effect than a reduction in supply. The exemption applies to domestic production as well as imports. OPS said it would be too much work to administer domestic price ceilings while foreign supplies were exempt.

The exemption of domestic mercury prices was made because one producer in this country was withholding his supplies of mercury from the market because his ceiling was too low.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative order of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

NOTICE REGARDING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have just obtained a 10-minute special order which I intend to use to answer an unwarranted and false charge made against me by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. I hope the gentleman from Texas will be present on the floor at that time.

NAME IT RICKENBACKER

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read to the House an editorial appearing in the Ohio State Journal of Friday, July 27, 1951, which exactly expresses my sentiments:

NAME IT RICKENBACKER

No more appropriate name than Rickenbacker Air Force Base could be given to the huge installation at Lockbourne, 10 miles southeast of Columbus, which contributed so much toward victory in World War II and is now being expanded to meet the new urgent defense needs of the Nation.

Surely the Nation, recognizing the almost unparalleled contribution of Columbus-born Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker to aviation—in time of war and in time of peace—will be solidly behind this move.

Rickenbacker, the Ace of Aces in World War I, carried his hero's role into one of the most useful and exemplary of lives—a lasting hero who has worked untiringly and always intelligently toward the promotion of aviation in all its many and far-flung phases.

The history of aviation and America's hero fliers is kept before the public by Air Force fields all over the Nation—Kelly, Chapman, Randolph, Barksdale, Mitchell, Wright-Patterson, and scores of others. Rickenbacker would be a wise and noble addition to this list.

A great American, Rickenbacker most certainly deserves this honor. And it should come during his lifetime. That fields have been named in the past as memorials need not deter the Air Force in making Rickenbacker the selection.

Rickenbacker's name would lend added prestige and dignity to the Lockbourne base. We hope the Air Force accedes to this move, confident that it will meet the approval of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, although Eddie Rickenbacker is my long-time personal friend,

I urge naming this field for him, not merely to honor him but to honor his home community and to inspire the Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to join the gentleman from Ohio in his tribute to Eddie Rickenbacker, one of the greatest heroes of all time. Certainly that field should be named after him.

Mr. VORYS. I hope you all feel that way and will so express yourselves to the Air Force.

MEXICAN LABOR

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, some few weeks ago we passed Public Law 78. The people of my district were pleased that we would be able to obtain Mexican laborers to help with the harvesting of our cotton crop. It now appears that the Department of Labor in making its regulations to carry out this law is making it not only very difficult but in some cases impossible to obtain the relief that we thought we were to attain.

Under the law that we passed it was provided that the Labor Department would be permitted to charge not to exceed \$15 per worker for expenses incurred in bringing these workers in. It now seems that they have set this as the fee that will be charged regardless of what the cost of recruitment and transportation to reception centers has been and, in addition to that, they are setting up, so I understand, regulations to charge \$7.50 for workers who are already in this country and who have been under contract and for whom no additional expense will be incurred. I think that regulation is wrong.

For instance, I am advised that one group of cotton farmers in southeast Missouri arranged for and incurred the expense of transporting approximately 1,000 workers from Mexico who were employed to chop cotton during the cultivation of this crop. In order to provide employment for this group of Mexican workers during the summer in order that they would be available for the harvesting of the crop this fall, this farmer group in southeast Missouri, in cooperation with State and Federal agencies and in order to relieve a labor shortage in the berry and fruit districts of some of the Northern States, made arrangements for the utilization of this Mexican labor during the summer months. Although the cost of transportation from the Mexican border to southeast Missouri was borne by the farmers of my district, it is my understanding that under the regulations which have been approved by the Department of Labor they will be called upon to pay not less than \$7.50

per head for the privilege of using this labor in the harvesting of our cotton crop this fall. It appears that this fee is not only exorbitant but is not justified and, furthermore, in my opinion, it is contrary to the intent of the law passed by Congress in recognition of the urgent need for labor necessary to harvest crops which had been planted at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture in an effort to attain goals believed necessary to the war effort.

Herewith I quote from a telegram received from the Southeast Missouri Harvesting Co., representing a cooperative group of cotton producers in southeast Missouri:

Under Public Law 78, section 502 (2), the bill states employer must agree to reimburse United States Department of Labor for essential expenses incurred for transportation and subsistence of workers in amounts not to exceed \$15 per worker. We understand contract forms and instructions being released to regional offices with regard to this section of bill provide that—

1. Employers recontracting workers now in the States must pay \$15 per head for that privilege.

2. If the employer has men under contract and needs to have worker contracts extended, he must pay \$7.50 per head.

3. Employers must pay \$15 per head for each man contracted at the reception center. This amounts to a flat head tax of \$7.50 or \$15 per man that the Secretary of Labor is charging the farmer.

Testimony of Senator ELLENDER and Congressman POAGE at time bill was being considered by both House and Senate clearly emphasized that under no circumstances was a head tax to be considered. This arbitrary stand for maximum charges on the part of the labor lawyers in the Secretary's office is in complete defiance of the law's intent to charge the farmer for actual expenses for transportation of the worker to the border reception center. Our association recruited 1,000 workers in Mexico for cotton chopping. Our actual recruitment costs, including subsistence and transportation to border, averaged \$2.61 per man. It also appears that labor is determined the American farmer turn every penny of substance he might hope to realize on his efforts in producing essential food and fiber to the other fellow. Costs on our crop to date prohibit us from attempting to harvest it this fall if Secretary Tobin allows this arbitrary action on the part of his employees to stand. Cotton will not be picked in the Mississippi Valley unless you are able to assist in securing relief for us from this exorbitant schedule. We request that the Department be required to sit down with a committee of farmers and work out questions relative to costs and other requirements necessary to operation of contract and program.

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI HARVESTING CO.,
WALTER ERB, Manager.

I hope that those who have been designated by the Secretary of Labor to conduct this program will reconsider the action taken in announcing the regulations under which the cotton producers in my area contend they will be unable to operate. Already they have made an unprecedented investment in this 1951 cotton crop and have suffered irreparable loss on account of excessive rains which have caused much of this crop to be abandoned and which in turn has caused this to be without a doubt the most expensive cotton crop ever to be produced in southeast Missouri.

BOOTS AND SADDLES

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced a bill calling for the reactivation of a division of horse cavalry in the Armed Forces. The record of the Russian ground troops in the Crimea and in the Caucasus in the last war, where they used cavalry extensively to turn the German flank, was most effective. Likewise in Korea we have ample testimony that the Chinese and North Koreans are using horse cavalry effectively. Our Army, as usual, say, there is no need for such a thing, and they have to be shown.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald which is headed "Horse marines' back in saddle." The Marines are now reactivating the old horse marines. When the Army tells us that they cannot use horse cavalry and there is no need for it, I say, as usual, "Tell it to the Marines."

"HORSE MARINES" BACK IN SADDLE AT QUANTICO, VA.

(By James Lee)

The "horse marines" are back in business today and the stirring notes of Boots and Saddles once more puts dashing warriors astride spirited steeds at Quantico, Va.

Although the Army nearly a year ago abolished the horse cavalry of proud tradition, the United States Marines have come to the rescue of old dobbin as an instrument of warfare.

The Quantico Marine Corps base has in full gallop a course in the use of the horse in modern combat.

PROVED VALUE IN WAR

Marine spokesmen said that regardless of the Army's decision to banish the horse, the need for four-footed beasts of battle and burden was demonstrated in Italy and Burma during World War II and more recently in Korea.

Therefore, a course was set up to teach marine platoon commanders the tactical use of the pack saddle, care of the animal, rough-riding techniques, and the carrying of ammunition and supplies over rugged terrain under combat conditions.

The first class of 25 saddle-sore but elated second lieutenants recently completed the course and a second class with the same number of officers is now going over the jumps.

"HORSE MARINES" CITED

Although leathernecks traditionally are saltier than a scupper and generally associated with life on the bounding main, the corps has had plenty of horses in its history.

In times past, many a marine has been yanked from a battlewagon's fo'c's'le to do mounted duty ashore and old-time devil dogs recall with glee the exploits of the "horse marines" in prewar China.

Horsemanship instructors at Quantico point out that crack cavalry brigades are elite components of the Russian army, and that old-fashioned cavalry charges by the Chinese and North Korean Communists have been reported more than once during the present hostilities.

CAVALRY BILL OPPOSED

As the thunder of hoofbeats rumble on the plains of Quantico, Congress has before it a bill to reactivate the Army's horse cavalry.

The legislation is opposed by mechanization-minded brass, which told the House Armed Services Committee that "the horse has lost its usefulness on the battlefield."

But the service die-hards—and there are many—who believe the mounted soldier could still be a top-notch fighting man in anybody's war, scornfully retort: "Tell that to the Marines."

CONGRESSMEN'S VOTING RECORDS AND INCOME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting record of Members of Congress, and make available information relative to the income of Members of the House.

I feel that the wide dissemination of a Congressman's voting record should be made so that the people will know where he stands on each and every issue that is brought before the Congress for its consideration and disposal. Mr. Speaker, I feel that to provide more democracy in the operations of the United States House of Representatives, and to more effectively discharge its obligations, Members should file with the Clerk of the House a report containing full and complete statements as to, first, the amount and sources of all income received by such Member during the preceding year, including all fees, salaries, income from trusts or estates, and dividends received or credited to his account, and, if such income is derived from a law firm or partnership, the names of the clients of such firm or partnership from whom fees were received; and, second, all dealings in securities or commodities by such Member, or by any person acting on behalf of, or pursuant to the direction of, such Member during the preceding year.

Under my measure the Clerk of the House will be directed to compile and to publish within 3 weeks after the close of each session of Congress a tabulation of the voting record of its Members on all roll-call votes, together with brief descriptions of the issues voted upon. For the purpose of easy readability and quick reference, each Member's votes shall be gathered in one place. The Superintendent of Documents shall sell copies at cost, and shall print sufficient copies so that a supply is on hand at all times. It is impossible today for any voter to get such information from the Congress without authorization of the Member whose voting record is sought.

It is my hope that the Congress will see fit to consider this legislation and report it favorable at the earliest opportunity.

WILLIAM N. OATIS

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ARMSTRONG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE STEPHEN T. EARLY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American whose death on last Saturday has saddened the Nation.

Stephen T. Early began his distinguished career as a newspaperman and served with the United Press and the Associated Press. His record in this difficult field was notable for his achievements.

I came to know Steve Early very well when he was called to the White House to serve in the capacity of press secretary for President Roosevelt. I know of the high regard and warm friendship in which he was held by our late President. On President's Roosevelt's death Steve Early continued his arduous duties serving President Truman faithfully and with a high sense of duty through some of the most important years of our history. President Truman paid high tribute to him for his splendid service.

During his tenure of office as Under Secretary of Defense, an all-important post to which he was called by President Truman, Steve Early again proved his vision and ability as well as his courage and willingness to follow the course of duty as his contribution to the betterment of our Nation and its citizens.

Steve Early, competent and efficient, gave of himself to his country unselfishly and at great sacrifice. He served his country with ability, courage, honor and distinction.

I personally have lost a close friend and one for whom I had the highest regard and admiration.

Mr. Speaker, I know I voice the sentiments of this House when I extend and express to Mrs. Early and her sons and daughter my deepest sympathy in their great loss and sorrow. I am sure they find comfort in the great work of husband and father. Steve Early will long be remembered for his contributions as a citizen and as a public official. He will long linger in the minds of those who knew him and his outstanding work has left his imprint on the pages of American history.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 152]

Abblitt	Garmatz	Ostertag
Adair	Gary	Patterson
Addonizio	Gavin	Perkins
Allen, Ill.	Gordon	Philbin
Allen, La.	Gore	Poulson
Anfuso	Granahan	Powell
Barden	Grant	Radwan
Baring	Green	Redden
Barrett	Greenwood	Riley
Bender	Gwinn	Rivers
Bennett, Mich.	Hall	Robeson
Betts	Edwin Arthur	Rodino
Boggs, Del.	Hand	Rogers, Mass.
Boggs, La.	Hart	Roosevelt
Bonner	Hays, Ohio	Sabath
Boykin	Hébert	St. George
Breen	Hedrick	Sasscer
Brehm	Heffernan	Saylor
Burton	Heller	Scott, Hardie
Busbey	Hess	Scott,
Butler	Hinshaw	Hugh D., Jr.
Byrnes, Wis.	Javits	Sheehan
Canfield	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Carlyle	Kearns	Sittler
Case	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Celler	Kennedy	Staggers
Chatham	Klein	Stanley
Chudoff	Lantaff	Taber
Clemente	Latham	Tackett
Corbett	McCulloch	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	McDonough	Teague
Dawson	McGrath	Thomas
DeGraffenried	Mack, Ill.	Towe
Dingell	Mason	Watts
Dollinger	Miller, Md.	Welch
Dondero	Miller, N. Y.	Welch
Donohue	Morano	Werdell
Donovan	Morgan	Wharton
Doughton	Morris	Wheeler
Durham	Morrison	Whitaker
Ellsworth	Morton	Wildnall
Elston	Moulder	Wigglesworth
Engle	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Ga.
Fallon	Norblad	Wood, Idaho
Fine	O'Brien, Mich.	Yorty
Fogarty	O'Konski	
Furcolo	O'Neill	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 295 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMENDING AND EXTENDING THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4521) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4521, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Agriculture is presenting this bill, H. R. 4521, which is a bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948. I would like to say that the report of our committee was unanimous. I do not recall that any single witness appeared before the committee in opposition to the bill, although we had hearings extending over a period of 7 days.

I feel that by reading some excerpts from the report I can give you succinct information concerning the purposes and provisions of the bill which is now before you, and with your permission I would like to read briefly from the report:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The accompanying bill reenacts, with relatively minor changes, the Sugar Act of 1948 which otherwise would terminate on December 31, 1952. The bill extends the act for 4 years, until December 31, 1956. It also amends the Internal Revenue Code by extending the applicability of the excise tax on sugar for 4 years until June 30, 1957. Changes in the Sugar Act are confined to those portions of the law relating to quotas. The major change in quotas is to increase the allocation to Puerto Rico by 170,000 tons annually, and that to the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons. A quota of 300,000 gallons of liquid sugar is also established for the British West Indies to meet a particular situation in the molasses industry.

The allocation to the various producing areas on the mainland of the United States, and to Hawaii and the Philippine Islands, remains the same as in the existing law. A slight increase is provided in the allocation to foreign countries other than Cuba, which ship sugar into the United States, in order to restore to these countries their prewar ratio of sugar imports. Cuba's percentage share of the import trade in sugar is slightly reduced, but the actual tonnage of sugar which Cuba will ship to the United States is expected to increase, due to the fact that Cuba will receive a fixed percentage quota of an anticipated substantial increase in sugar consumption in the United States.

The provisions of the bill have been worked out in a series of conferences between producer and user groups in the sugar industry, representatives of the various sugar-producing areas, and an interdepartmental committee composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Interior, Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, and the Tariff Commission. Particular consideration has been given to the matter by the Departments of Agriculture, State, and Interior. In these conferences the interests of the various users and producers were carefully considered by the Government departments concerned and the bill represents a practical and equitable adjustment of those varying, and to some extent conflicting, interests. Many witnesses, representing both Government and industry, appeared before the committee during the 7 days of hearings on the bill, and unanimously recommended its enactment.

A few amendments were proposed but most of these would have had the effect of introducing new matter into the bill, rather than changing its present terms, and even those who proposed amendments indicated their support of the bill as reported, whether the amendments were included or not. The only substantive amendment actually made to the bill (the one providing the liquid-sugar quota for the British West Indies) is a committee amendment and was not proposed specifically by any witness during the hearings. As far as the committee is aware, there is no opposition anywhere to the enactment of this bill.

NATIONAL POLICY

Sugar is an essential food product, and it has long been the established policy of the United States Government, for defense and strategic reasons, to preserve within the United States the ability to produce at least a portion of this vital food product needed by American consumers. Due to the cheap labor available in tropical countries where sugar grows most abundantly, and to the fact that sugar (either beet or cane) is produced in some quantity in almost every country in the world, it is probable that little, if any, sugar would be grown in the United States if American producers had to compete on an open world market against the cheap production in other countries.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, we all know that we import most of our sugar from Cuba, but the passage of this legislation will not lessen the imports from that country, will it?

Mr. COOLEY. No, Cuba will probably send in more sugar than formerly.

Mr. SHORT. In fact, we will continue, or perhaps even increase our imports.

Mr. COOLEY. We have slightly increased the quotas for the full duty countries and to some slight degree the quota from Cuba has been reduced, but it is only a slight decrease and will be compensated for by the increased amount of sugar that Cuba will be able to send into the United States due to the increased consumption of sugar in the United States.

Mr. SHORT. And by granting increased quotas to both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands we will add materially to the economy of those two countries in which we are very much interested and for whom we are more or less responsible.

Mr. COOLEY. That is unquestionably true.

Mr. SHORT. And unless we do help them to help themselves it perhaps would be a drain on the Treasury, more or less, in the form of direct relief.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHORT. I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee and the members of this committee on reporting out this legislation, because, in my opinion, it will not increase the cost of sugar in the future. Will it?

Mr. COOLEY. No; definitely not.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that what we are doing here today, if we pass this bill, is just continuing a policy that has been in effect for many years and has successfully operated all during that time?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is accurate in his statement.

With reference to the national policy, I should like to read again one paragraph of this report:

Sugar is an essential food product, and it has long been the established policy of the United States Government—for defense and strategic reasons—to preserve within the United States the ability to produce at least a portion of this vital food product needed by American consumers. Due to the cheap labor available in tropical countries where sugar grows most abundantly, and to the fact that sugar (either beet or cane) is produced in some quantity in almost every country in the world, it is probable that little, if any, sugar would be grown in the United States if American producers had to compete on an open world market against the cheap production in other countries.

I call your attention to the chart on page 3 of the report showing how wages in the United States sugar-producing areas compare with those in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to observe that this sugar program is a vital part and parcel of our farm program. It has operated so satisfactorily that the average citizen is not aware of the fact that we have a program in existence. Actually there are many Members of Congress who seem not to be aware of the fact that we have had a sugar program in operation for many years. There is one fact that I am certain is not generally known—that this is a part of the farm program which is definitely in the interest of the consumers of America. It is not sponsored by the farmers only or by the producers of sugar beets and sugarcane.

Mr. SHORT. I was going to ask the gentleman that very question. Would the passage of this legislation in any manner or degree injure the growers of sugar beets, particularly in States like Michigan and Colorado or the growers of sugarcane in States like Louisiana?

Mr. COOLEY. In answer to the gentleman's question, I think I would be safe in saying that but for this problem the producers referred to by the gentleman from Missouri would be forced out of business, whereas with this program they are given definite allocations and they are satisfied with the allocations which they will receive under this bill.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina and the members of this committee are very eager to do everything in their power to develop our own economy and help our domestic farmers.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly we are.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. How do the quotas permitted under this bill compare with the amount of sugar that has come into this country from foreign countries in the past?

Mr. COOLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the report, which gives the quantity of sugar that is imported. On page 4 of the report, about midway of the page, appears the following:

In 1950, under this quota system, domestic producing areas supplied 54.08 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States, as follows: Mainland beet and cane areas, 27.39 percent; Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, 12.85 percent; Hawaii, 13.84 percent. The Philippines supplied 5.72 percent; Cuba, 39.46 percent; and all other foreign countries, 0.74 percent.

The changes will result in Puerto Rico being given 170,000 additional tons and the Virgin Islands 6,000 additional tons. The other areas, the beet and cane sugar areas, would remain the same. There will be a slight change in the Cuban quota.

Mr. GOLDEN. The over-all picture, as I understand it, will be that the consuming public will have more sugar coming in under this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Absolutely. If it were not for this program, it is doubtful, as I pointed out, whether our own producers would be able to stay in business. But for this law, it is highly probable, we would not have an abundance of sugar available to the consumers of this country for the reason that the world market price is substantially above the domestic market price.

Mr. GOLDEN. There is nothing in this bill which would tend to increase the cost to the consumer of sugar?

Mr. COOLEY. No, it would be quite to the contrary. I would like to point out that during the operation of this bill, through all of the emergencies that we have encountered, sugar has been about the cheapest of all foods.

Mr. GOLDEN. Do you think you will be able to maintain that under the operation of this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Under this bill, yes, sir, I think so.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. It will aid not only Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, but also the people in Hawaii?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. I think the Delegate from Hawaii and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico were very well pleased with the bill we are presenting.

I think the general public should know the facts about the cost involved in this program. During a recent debate on the floor of the House, and in a recent article which appeared in the Washington Post, only one part of the story was told. They pointed out the tremendous amount of money that had been paid out by the Federal Government to the producers of sugar, when as a matter of fact, they failed to tell that in the over-all operation of this program, the Federal Treasury netted a profit over and above administrative costs of \$230,364,522; and that we have taken that amount from the producers in excess of the amount we have paid back to the producers, and we have enriched the Federal Treasury to the extent of more than \$230,000,000 or an annual profit of approximately \$16,000,000. We have sta-

bilized the price of sugar. We have protected the continental producers and those who produce in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and we have provided the consuming public with an abundance of this very vital food product. It is strange to me how the public can be so woefully misled, when by making inquiry the public could be well-informed about all parts of this farm program. Before the House recesses, I hope to present a rather comprehensive statement with regard to the over-all operations of the farm program. All of us know that we have sustained substantial losses on commodities like potatoes, eggs, and wool, but I believe when I collect the information, we can show that we have made \$230,000,000 profit on sugar, and approximately \$225,000,000 on cotton, and several million dollars on tobacco. When we put that all together, we actually believe we will come up in the black, and can show an actual profit in the over-all operation of this program which has meant so much to the producers and consumers of this country.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. D'EWARD. The gentleman said that the Government has sustained a loss on the wool program. Is that true? My understanding is that the wool program in itself shows a profit.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not sure I have the figure, but my recollection is that we had sustained a loss of approximately \$90,000,000 at one time. How much of that loss has been recovered, I am not in a position to say.

Mr. D'EWARD. All the wool that was accumulated during the last war has since been disposed of, and I believe the Government has made a profit over and above the actual acquisition price.

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad the gentleman has called attention to that because, if that is the case, it improves the picture that I am trying to visualize.

Mr. D'EWARD. The stock which is now held by the Government is a small amount, which is being held for experimental purposes. All of the stock which was held in warehouses has been disposed of.

Mr. COOLEY. As I say, in preparing my statement, which I will make available to the Members, I will obtain accurate current information as to each commodity and list it in detail so that the public will know that when we come from the Committee on Agriculture we are not asking for subsidies, we are not asking for hand-outs, we are not asking to be placed at any advantage over any other segment of the economy.

I would like to conclude by saying that this bill comes here free from any semblance of partisan politics. As Democrats and Republicans, we have worked like statesmen on this bill, as we try to do on all other bills. Seldom, if ever, do partisan considerations come into our deliberations.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. In reading this bill I find what might be termed a sales tax or a

subsidy. How do you reconcile your position on the basis of the speech you made against subsidies in the control bill and the advocacy of subsidies in this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. This is an entirely different proposition. The subsidy in the control bill was a consumer subsidy, which unfortunately was charged up against Agriculture. If you will look at the record of consumer subsidies during World War II, you will see that it ran into a substantial amount of money.

Mr. WIER. Well, this is a subsidy against the people.

Mr. COOLEY. No; no. It is not. It is a tax imposed on the producer, and it is paid into the Treasury; and then for compliance with these provisions an amount of money is paid back to the producer. But actually the money comes from the producer in the first place. I know that the gentleman comes from a consuming district, but if we did not have this program, the Lord only knows what your consumers would have been paying for sugar.

Mr. WIER. Then we would have the free-enterprise system in full operation.

Mr. COOLEY. And you would be competing with foreign labor. If you will be kind enough to look at the chart as to the cost of labor in the different producing areas, it is very easy to see that the American producer could not stay in business and compete with foreign labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

H. R. 4521 extends the Sugar Act of 1948 for 4 years with some minor changes. All of these changes relate to matters of detail rather than principle. In the main they have been suggested by experience in the administration of the present law or as a result of changed conditions. The most important changes are those relating to quotas.

The allocation to Puerto Rico is increased by 170,000 tons annually and that of the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons. A new quota of 300,000 gallons of liquid sugar is established for the British West Indies. The other principal change with respect to quotas is contained in the provision which reduces the percentage share of imports from Cuba from 98.64 percent to 96 percent of all imports excepting those from the Philippines, and increases the import quotas for full-duty countries from 1.36 percent to 4 percent of all imports except those from the Philippines. The amount of sugar involved in this change is small, and although the Cuban percentage is slightly reduced, this in all probability does not mean any reduction in the amount of sugar imported from Cuba since all increases in the consumption of sugar in this country will come from the imports from Cuba and the full-duty countries.

I was a Member of Congress and a member of the Committee on Agriculture at the time of the enactment of the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of 1934. I well recall the chaotic condition which prevailed in the sugar industry in all of its phases both in this country and in

Cuba prior to that time. The enactment of the Jones-Costigan Act was of tremendous benefit to the producers, refiners, and distributors of sugar in this country and in Cuba as well as the consumers of sugar in this country. The act was a compromise between the conflicting interests represented in the industry. It was based upon the principle of give and take between highly competitive groups, all of whom were in severe distress at the time.

Since 1934 the essential principles of the Jones-Costigan Act with some changes in details have been reenacted in the Sugar Act of 1937 which was extended through various enactments until December 31, 1947, and by the Sugar Act of 1948 which became effective on January 1 of that year.

This sugar legislation has been extremely successful. It has resulted in stabilizing the industry. It has enabled it to recover from a condition of prostration in 1934 to a condition of economic soundness and prosperity at the present time. These benefits to producers and distributors have not been at the expense of consumers. In fact consumers have shared in the benefits of the act fully as much as have producers.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I wish to state briefly my own observation while in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands nearly 2 years ago on a study there by the Committee on Ways and Means, a study of the social-security program as applied to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Our observation there at that time was that much of the economy of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands depends on the quantity of their sugar marketed in the United States, of course; and their greatest need was an increase in their sugar quota. As I recall our observation at that time the increase desired and needed by them was very much in accord with the action you have taken in this proposed legislation in increasing the quota allocated to Puerto Rico by 170,000 tons annually and in increasing the quota allocated to the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons annually. I want to commend the committee very highly on taking the action you have taken in this bill with reference to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman, and I believe that the increase which has been granted to Puerto Rico will greatly assist that area in stabilizing its economy and will afford an outlet for a substantial increase in sugar production over what it has been in the past.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman absolutely.

Mr. HOPE. I am very happy that we were able to make that increase, and it can be done without taking anything from any other area because there has been a consistent increase in consumption due to population increases.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I wish to ask a question in connection with the matter raised by

the gentleman from Iowa. About 2 weeks ago the Committee on Education and Labor had before it a bill to increase the school-lunch program, or to permit them in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in view of the fact that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are part of this country and entitled to some recognition. I remember that the delegates from those three areas appeared before our committee on behalf of their school children, their schools, and their economy in the matter of providing an adequate free school-lunch program. I remember the Delegate from Puerto Rico—I see him sitting here—raised the question that the economy of Puerto Rico was dependent a good deal upon the very subject that is before the House today. They have considerable room for expansion of their sugar production and refining. On the basis of that being the principal industry of the island on which they are dependent to a great degree for funds to operate their schools, and so forth, if I understood the question of the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman's answer, you have increased the amount of the sugar quota for Puerto Rico. Is that correct?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. The quota of Puerto Rico was increased by 170,000 tons and while that perhaps is not all that Puerto Rico would have liked to have received, I presume no one area has gotten everything it desired. It is a substantial increase and will help a very great deal in stabilizing the economy on that area.

In his statement at the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, Lawrence Myers, the Director of the Sugar Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture summarized the results which have been brought about by the 1934 Sugar Act and subsequent legislation. I call particular attention to the following paragraphs taken from Mr. Myers' statement before the committee on June 27 and found on pages 6 and 7 of the printed hearings:

The Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of 1934 and the Sugar Act of 1937 constituted the major means by which our domestic sugar industries and the sugar industry of Cuba were brought from severe economic depression to full recovery. During the war the payment provisions under the Sugar Act helped to maintain production in the face of rising costs and controlled sugar prices. Since the war, the Sugar Act of 1948 has largely stabilized domestic sugar prices. In 1948 and 1949 it helped to keep our domestic prices from falling unduly. During the past year the Sugar Act has been given the new role of keeping domestic prices below the world level. In recent weeks while world raw-sugar prices were shooting upward to over 8 cents per pound, f. a. s. Cuba, the rise in domestic prices was moderate.

Some comparisons between 1933, the last year before the sugar legislation was put into effect, and 1950 will demonstrate a few of the benefits that have been derived from our sugar legislation.

The average retail price of refined sugar rose from 5.3 cents per pound in 1933 to 9.75 cents per pound in 1950, a rise of 84 percent. The duty-paid price of raw sugar in New York also rose by 84 percent. The price of all foods, however, rose by 143 percent. Therefore, the rise in prices of sugar to consumers has been only about 60 percent as

much as the rise in prices of foods as a whole.

In contrast with the rise of 84 percent in the price of sugar, returns to domestic growers per ton of sugar beets and sugarcane increased by around 170 percent. In other words, the increase in grower returns per unit was twice as large as the increase in the price to consumers.

Since domestic producers have also shared in this country's increased consumption, total returns of sugar-beet and sugarcane growers have risen from approximately \$133,000,000 in 1933 to \$432,000,000 in 1950, a rise of 225 percent.

Average wage rates for field labor in the domestic sugar-beet and sugarcane areas in 1950 were 393 percent of the 1934 level.

The most striking effects of our sugar legislation concern Cuba. In 1933, Cuban producers received 1.1 cents per pound, f. a. s., for sugar shipped to the United States; in 1950, they received 5.1 cents per pound, an increase of 360 percent. Imports from Cuba rose from 1,552,000 tons in 1933 to 3,264,000 tons in 1950. The income Cuba received from sugar shipped to the United States in 1950 was nine times as large as it was in 1933. Incidentally, the value of United States exports to Cuba in 1950 was more than 18 times the value of such exports in 1933.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I think the largest percentage was to the cane growers, not to the beet growers. I believe the figure for beet growers is 84 percent.

Mr. HOPE. Well, I have not broken down the figures, but there was a substantial increase as far as returns are concerned to both groups during that period of time. Also, of course, the domestic growers have had a share in the increased consumption.

To those who are interested I recommend the reading of Mr. Myers' complete testimony before the committee which will be found in three parts on pages 3, 13 and 269 of the printed hearings.

May I say in passing that I was personally very much impressed with Mr. Myers' statement and with the manner in which he has administered the Sugar Act since taking over the position of Director of the Sugar Branch. I have heard many other members of the committee make similar comments with respect to Mr. Myers and his work.

In the hearings before the committee a large number of witnesses were heard, none of whom were in disagreement with the fundamental provisions of this bill. These witnesses represented producers, both domestic and foreign, importers, refiners, distributors, labor organizations, and consumers, as well as representatives of Government agencies and Members of Congress. The act has the full support of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of State, all of which by reason of the wide ramifications of the sugar industry at home and abroad are seriously concerned with this legislation. Various witnesses made suggestions covering minor amendments, but none of them, as my recollection goes, had anything but praise for the purpose and general principles involved in the legislation.

The bill as introduced was the result of conferences between all segments of the industry and the Government departments concerned. It probably does not represent a perfect bill in the eyes of many of those who are affected by it, but in my opinion it constitutes a compromise which is fair to the sugar industry in all of its aspects and to sugar consumers.

I think that it is proper at this time to say that I know of no legislation on the statute books which goes any further than does the present Sugar Act or the pending bill in the protection of the consumer. Nor do I know of any legislation which goes further than the 1948 act and the pending bill in the protection of the workers engaged in the industry. I call particular attention to the provisions prohibiting the employment of child labor and those that require that growers must pay laborers wages at least equal to those determined to be fair by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I do not say that this bill is a perfect piece of legislation, but I do say it goes as far as any piece of legislation can go in dealing with the many competitive and conflicting interests, both national and international, involved in the production and distribution of sugar, and at the same time it fully protects the interests of consumers. There are many interested groups who would like to have slight changes in the bill which would be a direct benefit to them. If any element of the industry were writing the bill the details would undoubtedly be a little different, but in the over-all as a reconciliation of many conflicting interests, the bill is a good piece of legislation and should be enacted.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. This is the best example that I know of of cooperation between governments and industry to stabilize their business. My observations are based on what I know about my own district, which has four sugar refineries, and many, many beet-sugar growers. Since 1934 they have had complete stability, not only in the processing plants, but also on the ranches that raise the beets.

Mr. HOPE. I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman has said. I do not know how well a plan like this would work in any other industry. The sugar industry is peculiar in many ways, but in this particular instance the cooperation between Government and business and between the different elements in the industry has, in my opinion, constituted an example of business statesmanship which perhaps has had no equal anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take much of the Committee's time, as the bill has been thoroughly explained by the distinguished

Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. But I do want to express my appreciation to the Committee on Agriculture for the consideration that has been given to this problem and the expeditious manner in which it has been presented to the House.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we are considering will continue until the end of 1956 the sugar quota plan which was adopted in 1934. This plan is a substitute for relying upon a tariff on sugar to protect our domestic sugar industry.

The Jones-Costigan Sugar Act was passed in 1934 when it had become clearly evident that our tariff on sugar was not accomplishing the purposes for which it was intended. Our domestic sugar-producing areas were in a severely depressed condition and conditions in Cuba were chaotic, threatening to blow up the economic and political organization of that country.

The Jones-Costigan Sugar Act established a system of sugar quotas to regulate the quantity of sugar which could come into our market from each domestic and foreign area. It provided that the tariff rate on sugar would be reduced by the amount of an excise tax to be put into effect. At the time the tariff rate on Cuban sugar was 2 cents a pound, the excise tax was set at half a cent a pound, and the tariff reduced to one and a half cents. Since that time, through successive trade agreement negotiations, the rate of the import tariff on sugar has been greatly reduced. It now is only a half a cent a pound.

With the tariff at this very low rate, our domestic sugar industry would be virtually without protection if the sugar quota system were not continued. Moreover, our sugar-beet and sugarcane farmers cannot make plans for their future farming operations unless they know what the Government is going to do to protect their industry.

This point is well illustrated by the fact that a sugar-beet farmer who plants a crop of sugar beets early in the spring of 1952 will be dependent for his returns from that crop upon sugar prices up to the late fall of 1953.

Our present sugar program has been eminently successful. Sugarcane and sugar-beet farmers have, on the whole, received satisfactory returns for their crops, the position of sugar factories has been stabilized, and at the same time consumers have been provided an adequate supply of sugar at very reasonable prices. In fact, sugar has continued to be the housewife's cheapest food.

One outstanding fact about this part of our farm support program—the Sugar Act—is that it not only has never cost the Government a single penny but, on the contrary, the sugar excise tax has yielded about \$16,000,000, on the average, each year since the program began. This has amounted to a total of about \$230,000,000 in net revenue to the Government.

The committee hearings on this bill, at which every interested person was urged to express his views, showed that none was opposed to the enactment of

this bill. Accordingly I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I, too, will not impose on the committee's time, since there is no opposition to the bill, but I would like to mention a few things about the sugar business itself.

Mr. Chairman, sugar is one of our most important foods. On the average, it supplies about 18 percent of our total food-energy needs. We in the United States consume nearly one-fourth of all the commercial sugar produced in the world, far more than is consumed in any other country. We produce in our several domestic areas somewhat more than one-half of the sugar we consume. Nevertheless, we are the largest importer of sugar in the world.

Because of these facts, our sugar-program legislation is of great importance. It is important to all of us as consumers and to many thousand farmers and workers in sugar factories and other branches of the industry. It also is very important in our foreign-trade relations. Thus sugar legislation must give full consideration to all of these interests, balancing any conflicting aspects, and providing a sugar policy and program which will best serve the consumers as well as the producers.

I felt this objective had been achieved in the sugar-quota legislation which was first enacted as the Jones-Costigan Act in 1934. This was replaced by the Sugar Act of 1937 which in turn was replaced by the Sugar Act of 1948. This act will expire on December 31, 1952. The bill which we are considering will extend this law for an additional 4 years with certain changes in some of its provisions.

Extension of the Sugar Act at this time, and for a period of 4 years, will be of great help to farmers in planning their crop rotations and in general farm practices. It will also give assurance of stable conditions for consumers and industrial users of sugar. This legislation assures them that there will be an adequate supply of sugar at fair and reasonable prices.

The chief features of the present Sugar Act and of those which preceded it are, briefly:

First. A system of annual quotas governing the quantity of sugar to be supplied to our market by each domestic and foreign area.

Second. Limitations on the quantities of sugar which can be brought into the continental United States in refined form.

Third. An excise tax of one-half of a cent a pound, raw value, on all sugar.

Fourth. Provision for conditional payments to domestic producers of sugar beets and sugar cane. In connection with this provision it should be borne in mind that receipts from the tax on sugar have exceeded these payments by an average of \$16,000,000 a year—a total of \$230,000,000 since 1934.

Fifth. Provisions for the establishment of minimum wage rates for workers on sugar beet and sugar cane farms and for minimum prices for sugar beets and sugar cane.

The bill we are considering will make relatively minor amendments in the present law, and extend it for 4 years. The chief changes will be to increase the quota of Puerto Rico by 170,000 tons, that of the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons, and the quotas for the so-called full-duty countries, that is, foreign countries other than Cuba and the Philippines, by a small amount. No change will be made in the quotas of the beet-sugar area, the mainland cane-sugar area, or Hawaii. Likewise, no change will be made in the tax and payment provisions nor in those relating to the determination of sugar consumption requirements. To correct a technical defect in the act, a quota will be provided for liquid sugar from the British West Indies.

In the committee report which is before you, there are some graphic illustrations of the benefits which this sugar legislation has helped to promote. The first chart, which is on page 3, shows that the farm workers in most of our domestic sugar areas receive far higher wages than do such workers in most foreign countries. At the same time, as the chart on page 8 shows, the price of sugar to the consumer is cheaper in the United States than in most foreign countries. On page 11 is a chart which shows that sugar in this country has remained lower over the years in relation to price than any other food. This chart also shows our average per capita consumption of sugar has steadily increased. It is higher than in most foreign countries—about three times the world average. Thus, it is clearly evident that our sugar program has proven to be of great benefit both to producers and to consumers.

As the committee states in its report, this bill was approved unanimously by the committee.

To continue, let us discuss for a moment one of the questions that always arises when we are considering the Sugar Act, and that is, our import and export relations with Cuba. In 1930 the United States Tariff Act set the rates of 2 cents per pound in raw sugar from Cuba and 2½ cents per pound on raw sugar from foreign countries. These rates were intended to give adequate production to our domestic-sugar industry as well as guard it against depressions. However, our sugar industry went further and deeper into depression and large inventories of sugar accumulated. Beet and sugarcane growers were in financial difficulties. Wages for workers in both cane and beet fields were low and prosperity seemed a long way off. By 1933 it was evident that the tariff was no longer adequate to protect our domestic sugar industry and further it was evident that the financial position in our agricultural sugar-producing areas was affecting both our export and import trade.

In 1934 the Congress developed and passed the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act. The bill we are considering contains the general features and operates much the same way as the original Jones-Costigan sugar legislation.

When the Sugar Act of 1948 was passed by this Congress our domestic sugar-producing areas, beet and cane, were placed under fixed quotas as was also

the Philippines, and should there be deficits in our domestic areas, 98.64 percent of our necessary sugar requirements would all go to Cuba and 1.36 percent to the full-duty countries. The full-duty countries you will find listed on page 103 of the hearings. Table No. 5 gives you the basis on which the full-duty countries basic quota was prorated under the 1936 regulation and table 6 gives the quotas which would result for each of the principal full-duty countries as effected by the recommended changes of the 1948 Sugar Act.

Cuba imported into the United States in 1933 1,550,000 tons of sugar and under the 1948 act it had increased to 3,150,000 tons. Its quota duty under the act now in operation is 2,640,000 tons. Cuba has increased its sugar production, as you will note by table 4, page 103, of the hearings, from 3,379,000 short tons of raw sugar in 1937 to 6,384,000 in 1951. Certainly this does not indicate that Cuba is having any trouble in producing sugar and disposing of it. I think after examining these tables and figures everyone must agree that we have treated Cuba fairly well and the change we are suggesting—dropping Cuba from 98.64 down to 96 percent of the possible deficits in quotas from full-duty countries is not of sufficient importance to cause any disturbance in our trade relations with Cuba.

Using a hypothetical case, under the present act should the world deficit on continental and mainland areas, including Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands amount to 750,000 tons, Cuba would receive 98.64 percent of the deficit, amounting to 739,800 tons. While under the new proposal of this act Cuba would receive 96 percent of the 750,000-ton deficit or 720,000 tons. The difference being only 19,800 tons.

On pages 15 to 18 of the hearings, in the testimony given by Lawrence Meyers, Director, Sugar Branch, PMA, United States Department of Agriculture, you will find a complete breakdown of the changes in the Sugar Act offered by this legislation.

Pages 70 and 71 contain a very interesting discussion by Mr. Meyers as to the rise of the world sugar production in the past 100 years. You will note that the world production 100 years ago was about 3,000,000 tons—today it is over 40,000,000. Cane-sugar production rose during that time from 2,500,000 tons to 25,000,000, while beet-sugar production rose from zero to 15,000,000 tons.

Quote page 71:

World sugar production has been increased not only by natural growth, but by subsidies in many countries, particularly the beet countries. Some countries even have direct and indirect export subsidies which force supplies into world markets at depressed prices. We have, of course, also the very, very low wage rates that prevail in many of the tropical areas. All these forces had a tremendous impact on world prices and brought the world sugar economy to its knees before the war, even before the depression of the 1930's.

In a table, published by a Senate committee on the utilization of farm crops, is found an interesting table showing the change in food habits since 1909. I en-

close as part of my remarks a news release I made on this table. Sugar and sirups—exclusive of use in condensed milk, processed fruits and vegetables—rose from 84 pounds per capita in 1909 to as high as 124 pounds in 1930, dropping back to 106 pounds in 1949:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Congressman WILLIAM S. HILL, Second District, Colorado, July 23, 1951)

CHANGING FOOD CONSUMPTION ALTERS MARKET DEMANDS

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics recently published statistics showing important changes in the pattern of consumer food consumption. Foods showing the greatest decrease in consumption are so-called staple products. The per capita consumption of cereal products has decreased from 296 pounds in 1909 to 173 in 1949. Potato consumption was 204 pounds per person in 1909, but in 1949, 112. An "apple a day" seems to be a thing of the past, for while we were consuming 55.5 pounds of apples per person in 1909, we now use only 30.8 pounds.

Dairy products (excluding butter) increased in consumption from 388 pounds per person in 1909 to 429 pounds in 1949; citrus fruits and tomatoes from 44 pounds in 1909 to 98 pounds per person in 1949; leafy green and yellow vegetables (including fresh) from 76 pounds per person in 1909 to 111 pounds in 1949; sugar from 84 pounds per person in 1909 to 106 pounds in 1949; coffee, tea, and cocoa from 10 pounds per person in 1909 to 19 pounds in 1949.

In spite of all the changes as indicated the retail weight equivalent of food consumed per person remained practically static. In 1909 we ate 1,576 pounds per person, and in 1949 it was 1,573 pounds. No doubt the decline in the use of human muscle power and the increase of mechanical devices are reflected in the consumption of the various kinds of food.

The preparation of milk for retail consumption has been one of the outstanding developments of the past 25 years. In 1945 milk consumption reached an all-time high of 337 pounds per person. In 1909 we consumed 274 pounds per person. Evaporated milk was consumed at the rate of 1.4 pounds in 1909, and increased to 17.7 pounds per person in 1949.

These changes in consumption habits are having a profound impact on farm production. We now have specialization in agriculture and the production of specific foods by geographic areas. Also, modern transportation and refrigeration of fresh fruits and vegetables throughout the year supply consuming areas effectively.

Home refrigeration and public frozen food lockers provide a handy supply of fresh meat, fruit, and vegetables. Modern improvements in the processing and packaging of food are changing the food habits of our people.

That is important, too. We change our food habits, and when you change your food habits you change your agricultural production habits, agricultural activities, agricultural products, agricultural sales. So we have been doing that in a remarkable degree.

As part of my remarks I wish to insert a part of this table. Sugar and sirups, exclusive of sugar used in condensed milk or processed fruits and vegetables, rose from 84 pounds per capita in 1909 to as high as 124 pounds in 1930. It dropped back to 106 pounds in 1949.

I hope the passage of this bill will be unanimous.

I promised to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana, and I shall be glad to yield now.

Mr. D'EWART. How does the Secretary arrive at the quota for domestic production and for the free-duty countries?

Mr. HILL. The law provides that by a certain date the Secretary of Agriculture, in connection with his advisers, is to meet and go over the whole situation, taking into consideration certain elements as then found, as well as the increase in population, and to determine what the amount of consumption of the entire United States will be the next year.

Mr. D'EWART. How does he determine that consumption in the United States?

Mr. HILL. The only thing he can go by, and I believe the law provides that he must take into consideration the figures that he has in the past as to what the consumption has been, and from that he arrives at what the consumption will be in the United States the next year. I do not think he has missed it on very many occasions.

Mr. D'EWART. How does he finally get to the price of sugar?

Mr. HILL. That is the important question. I might say, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] mentioned a moment ago, the way the sugar program has been handled it is not a subsidy program, because he must come to these two conclusions which the gentleman has mentioned: First, he must determine what the consumption will be in the United States. Then, after that, he must take into consideration the provision of the old Costigan-Jones Act, which was section 201, and read like this:

October 31 next preceding the calendar year for which the determination is being made, and shall make allowances for a deficiency or surplus in inventories of sugar, and for changes in consumption because of changes in population and demand conditions, as computed from statistics published by agencies of the Federal Government; and, in order that such determinations shall be made so as to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the domestic sugar industry by providing such supply of sugar as will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry, the Secretary, in making any such determination, in addition to the consumption, inventory, population, and demand factors above specified and the level and trend of consumer-purchasing power, shall take into consideration the relationship between the prices at wholesale for refined sugar that would result from such determination and the general cost of living in the United States as compared with the relationship between prices at wholesale for refined sugar and the general cost of living in the United States obtaining during 1947 prior to the termination of price control of sugar as indicated by the Consumers' Price Index as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is there any increased quota in this bill for the United States?

Mr. HILL. The domestic quotas for the United States, both for beet and cane sugar, are not changed or molested.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We have some new irrigated acreage in my district. Some GI's would like to grow sugar beets. How do they get a quota to raise sugar beets in this new area?

Mr. HILL. Strange as it may seem, in 1951—and that should be late enough—the acreage planted to sugar beets in 1951 is 26 percent below the usual acreage of sugar beets.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment and commend the Committee on Agriculture and its distinguished chairman for bringing in a bill that the industry seems to be agreed upon. I am particularly interested in this legislation for the reason that in my district we grow around 30,000 acres of sugarcane and produce around 110,000 tons of sugar. Now, that is a lot of sweetening. We are very pleased with the action of the committee in reporting out this bill.

If the Sugar Act were to expire without being replaced with an effective substitute, we would be forced to return to a policy of tariff protection despite its recognized inability to protect consumers, and its demonstrated inadequacies for the protection of sugar producers. The proposed act is a result of years of study and experience. Its ability to protect consumers as well as producers has been demonstrated, and it has been a most effective instrument in guaranteeing to farmers and laborers in the field the same benefits afforded industry.

The legislation embodied in this act, in my opinion, constitutes the most desirable method that has yet been developed for dealing with our domestic sugar problems. Comparisons between 1933, the year before our sugar legislation was first adopted, and 1950, will demonstrate a few of the benefits that have been derived from sugar legislation. The average retail price of refined sugar rose from 5.34 cents per pound in 1933 to 9.75 cents per pound in 1950, a rise of 84 percent. The price of all foods, however, rose by 143 percent. The rise in the price of sugar to consumers has only been about 60 percent as much as the rise in prices of foods as a whole. In contrast with the rise of 84 percent in the price of sugar, returns to domestic growers per ton of sugar beets and sugarcane increased around 170 percent. In other words, the increase in grower returns per unit was twice as large as the increase in the price to consumers. Total returns of sugar beet and sugarcane growers have risen from approximately \$133,000,000 in 1933 to \$432,000,000 in 1950, a rise of 225 percent. Average wage returns for agricultural labor in domestic sugar beet and sugarcane areas in 1950 were 393 percent of the 1934 level.

An excise tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds and an import compensating tax at the same rate are applied to sugar in order to operate the program and

equalize the cost of production in domestic and foreign areas. From the funds thus obtained, payments are made to domestic producers at a basic rate of 80 cents per hundred pounds of sugar, raw value, for the first 350 short tons of sugar produced on a farm and reduced progressively thereafter to a minimum of 30 cents per hundred pounds. Payment is made only to farmers who have complied with the provisions of the act.

Financially, this sugar program is unique—it not only pays for itself but it provides a net average annual profit to the Government of approximately \$16,000,000.

The passage of this proposed legislation will insure the people of Florida greater prosperity for the next 4 years. The sugar industry of my State employs directly and indirectly approximately 12,000 persons with an annual payroll in excess of \$3,000,000. The value of the crop at present-day prices is approximately \$20,000,000 annually.

Such a program to me seems well worth while. I urge its adoption.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, the Sugar Act of 1948 will expire on December 31, 1952. It has been decided, however, that the act should be extended by legislation adopted during the present session of Congress. The act is being extended now in order to enable the sugar producers in the domestic and foreign areas who supply our consumption in the United States to plan their production programs with the prior knowledge of an assured market during 1953 under the safeguards of sugar legislation.

Accordingly, the Sugar Act is being extended for 4 years; that is, from December 31, 1952, through December 31, 1956.

Sugar is such an essential food product that it has long been the established national policy of our Government to preserve within the United States the ability to produce an assured portion of this commodity. Due to the cheap labor available in tropical countries where sugar grows most abundantly, and to the fact that sugar is produced in at least some quantity in almost every country in the world, it can be easily understood, I think, that only a small portion of our requirements would be grown here if American producers had to compete on an open world market against the cheap production in other countries.

The history of our efforts to effectuate this national policy of preserving the production in the United States of a fair portion of our requirements goes back almost to the first days of our Republic. For many years tariff barriers were maintained against importation of sugar from other countries. The use of the tariff device as a means of assuring a fair portion of the market to local producers, however, had disadvantages which frequently overbalanced the expected benefits to our growers at home. Experience demonstrated that at times high tariffs had the effect of arbitrarily

increasing the price of sugar to consumers in the United States; and during other periods when sugar was most needed such barriers adversely affected the normal flow of adequate supply from foreign sources. At the same time, the price that the farmer and the sugar mill received was guided solely by the fluctuation of the world market in sugar. After struggling for more than a century with the tariff system; sometimes too high, sometimes too low, depending upon the administration in power and world conditions beyond our control, a quota system was written into law in the first Sugar Act of 1934, later revised and amended in the Sugar Acts of 1937 and 1948. Under the quota system, devised by the Sugar Acts, the Secretary of Agriculture is required in December of each year, based on available statistics and past performances, to estimate the quantity of sugar that will be consumed during the succeeding year in Continental United States. Then, with this estimate as a starting point, the Sugar Act provides a specific formula whereby the sugar producing areas are respectively given a quota or a fair share of the quantity of the sugar they can produce and supply to meet our requirements. The act provides for two types of quotas, namely: fixed quotas and variable quotas. Fixed quotas are allocated to the mainland beet area and the mainland cane area; and to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Republic of the Philippines. For instance, the quota of the mainland beet area is fixed by law at 1,800,000 tons, and the mainland cane quota is fixed by law at 500,000 tons of sugar per year. In other words, we get the first bite at the cherry, or the right to produce each year a fixed and guaranteed portion of our domestic requirements. The Sugar Act then provides that all United States requirements over and above fixed quotas shall be supplied by Cuba and full duty countries. Since the Cuban and full duty country quotas make up the surplus of our requirements after the fixed quotas are taken care of, such quotas vary from year to year and hence are called variable quotas. Because of our pleasant relationship with Cuba, however, the act guarantees that Cuba shall supply 96 percent of our supply over and above fixed quotas, and the other 4 percent is distributed to full-duty countries.

As I have explained, our consumption estimate is made in December of each year and based on it, the domestic and foreign producing areas are given quotas or shares of our consumption for the next succeeding year. As might be expected, it sometimes happens that certain areas find themselves unable to deliver their quotas. This is particularly true of the Philippines. So-called deficits thus arise and these deficits must be made up and reallocated to other producing areas. Again, Cuba is made the greatest beneficiary of these deficits. For example, the new legislation guarantees to Cuba the right to make up 95 percent of any Philippine deficit, and the other 5 percent of any possible deficits is distributed to full-duty countries.

Because of these obvious advantages set forth in the Sugar Act, Cuba remains our greatest source of foreign supply of sugar. Thus, in 1950, Cuba supplied 39.46 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States.

Finally, the Sugar Act as extended continues in effect the excise tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds on the refining of sugar and the import tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds on sugar coming in from Cuba and other areas. Nation-wide, these excise and import taxes of \$1 per hundred pounds have produced an average of a little over \$76,000,000 per year. Part of the funds thus obtained is used to pay bonuses to farmers who comply with their marketing quotas and the balance goes into the Treasury of the United States. Payments to farmers throughout the United States and expenses of administration have averaged about \$61,000,000 per year, leaving a balance of almost \$16,000,000 which goes into the Treasury of the United States. In other words, the sugarcane program as designed in the Sugar Act has resulted in a net profit of about \$16,000,000 per year to our Government.

Now, while the Sugar Act is being extended for 4 years, it is well to reflect upon and realize what the sugar industry means to Louisiana and what the sugar legislation means to the industry in my State. This is doubly important to the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States, because my district is generally regarded as the sugar bowl of the United States so far as cane sugar is concerned.

The sugar industry of Louisiana is composed of the following: 55 raw-sugar mills, 4 sugar refineries, 8,000 sugarcane growers.

Last year's crop brought to Louisiana in excess of \$70,000,000, and of that amount, approximately \$50,000,000 was distributed at the farm level. The industry provides direct employment on a year-round basis for more than 30,000 persons, and during the harvest season, employment for an additional 12,000 persons. Indirect employment on a very conservative basis is afforded to approximately four persons for every one directly employed, and on that basis, would provide direct and indirect employment for approximately 166,000. Included in this indirect employment are transportation employees, steamship, barge, truck, railway, longshoremen, employees in brokerage firms, and the many hundreds of firms which supply the industry with essential items from insecticides and fertilizers to high-pressure steam boilers and harvesting and cultivating equipment.

The proposed bill would reenact with relatively minor changes the Sugar Act of 1948 which otherwise would terminate December 31, 1952. The allocation to the various producing areas on the mainland of the United States and to Hawaii remains the same as in the existing law. The major change in quotas is an increase in the allocation to Puerto Rico by 170,000 tons annually and to the Virgin Islands by 6,000 tons annually. It is my understanding that both of

these areas badly need this quota increase in order to maintain present-day economy and in some measure upgrade the standard of living in those areas.

The sugar industry of Louisiana is in complete accord with this proposed increase. The provisions of the bill were worked out in a series of conferences between producer and user groups in the sugar industry, and an interdepartmental committee composed of representatives of Departments of State, Interior, Commerce, Treasury, and Agriculture and the Tariff Commission. Many witnesses representing both Government and industry appeared before the committee during the several days' hearings on the bill which has been unanimously recommended by the committee for enactment.

Financially, I want to repeat, the sugar program is the only Government agricultural program which pays a dividend. From 1934 through the end of the fiscal year 1950, taxes collected as a part of the sugar program amounted to \$987,752,416, while all payments and administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture in administering the program have totaled \$757,387,894, leaving an excess of taxes over expenditures, representing a net profit from the operations of the program, of \$230,364,522. Putting it on an annual basis, the average taxes collected are a little over \$76,000,000. Expenses, including administration and payments to growers, average about \$61,000,000 leaving a net annual profit of approximately \$16,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the consumers and producers of sugar in the State of Louisiana, I unhesitatingly recommend adoption of this proposed legislation which will bring to Louisiana for the next 4 years approximately \$70,000,000 annually and to the Treasurer of the United States approximately \$16,000,000 annually. Any legislation which puts dollars into private pockets and at the same time puts dollars into the Public Treasury is certainly worthy of passage by this body.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], in thanking the chairman and members of the Committee on Agriculture of the House and Mr. Meyers, the head of the Sugar Branch of the Department of Agriculture for the consideration they have given this legislation. There is no opposition to the bill that I know of, and therefore, since the situation and provisions of the bill have been fully discussed, and because it is only a renewal of existing legislation, with minor amendments, I do not feel it is proper to take any time to discuss the legislation further, as I feel that the House will pass the bill unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add however, that legislation in 1934 and this legislation since that time has saved a most important industry, not only in Louisiana, but in the other sugar-producing States of the mainland, as well as in our island possessions and other sugar-producing countries.

As an example, I well remember in 1933-34 when the sugar industry was about to be abandoned in Louisiana, the Delgado sugar plantation, near Jeanerette, La., with 3,300 acres of the finest sugar-producing land in Louisiana, together with a large sugar refinery worth nearly a half million dollars could have been purchased for \$75,000. I advised a relative of mine who was wealthy to buy this magnificent plantation with the refinery for the amount mentioned; however, he told me the sugar industry would never come back, and he did not take advantage of the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, while it is true that some improvements have been made to the refinery, I am sure that the plantation and refinery could not be purchased today for at least \$2,000,000. That situation was true in all the sugar-producing States at that time, and I know that to be a fact as I was in the fire-insurance business at that time, and it was impossible to obtain one dollar of insurance on any sugar refinery anywhere. The insurance companies would not insure a sugar refinery for any amount.

Mr. Chairman, the extension of this legislation will continue to stabilize and protect the sugar industry throughout the world, and will also guarantee the consumer against any excessive price for a commodity that is a necessity to every household and many of our industries who are large users of sugar.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire, to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I am always glad to be able to support legislation which enables different segments of an industry to work together in harmony and mutual gain. I wish to congratulate the Committee on Agriculture for the careful work and thinking which has gone into this bill. I am also pleased to note that this program, in addition to securing a plentiful supply of sugar at reasonable and stable prices, operates at a gain for the Treasury or to the people at large.

Sugar is primarily a food or a preserving agent and is no longer considered to be a luxury, as thousands of housewives will testify by gleaming rows of home canned food. The extension and changes in this bill are but the continuance of an equitable system for the control of sugar production and consumption which began back in 1934 with the Jones-Costigan Act. The major premise of this legislation, a quota system with an excise equalizer in terms of production costs as between domestic and foreign producers, has stood since that time. Some modifications were necessary to meet the exigencies of the war, but we have been able to avoid the great surge in price which occurred in 1920 by smoothing out the production in various areas damaged by the war or areas called upon for great increases to meet increased demand. This bill re-establishes the quotas in force prior to the disruption of the war, with some gain to Puerto Rico and the Barbados Islands and a negligible cut for Cuba which will probably be wiped out by the increase in total consumption. It retains

the percentage allocated to domestic producers, including our insular areas, so that the historic industry may be maintained. It also continues the regulations concerning wages, the employment of minors, and working conditions generally. This program is a fine example of producer, industry, and government working for the common good. I heartily recommend the support of this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to know that in the renewal of this sugar legislation consideration has been given to the enlargement of the quota from Puerto Rico. In the hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means in this island 2 years ago, we were very much impressed with the fact that although sugarcane is the principal crop of the island, under the restriction of the Sugar Act at that time, they were unable to plant to advantage a large proportion of their fertile soil in that crop, and although they had made many attempts to find other crops to grow they had not been successful in finding a profitable crop. Puerto Rico, as you know, is a very large island, and has perhaps the greatest density of population to be found anywhere in the world. I am delighted to know that the committee, under the renewal, has given the island some 170,000 additional tons in their quota. I commend the committee for it because I think it is certainly the proper thing to do. We sometimes forget that Puerto Rico is a part of our country, and that practically every person in the island now is a native-born American. I hope the committee will seriously consider the proposition of permitting a larger quantity of refined sugar to be shipped from Puerto Rico to the mainland. Of course, at the time the original Sugar Act was passed in 1934, they had very few refineries, and there have been no further refineries built there. But I feel sure that this is a subject which the committee can do well to further study. I wish to congratulate the committee for its action in this bill and for its splendid solution of the sugar problem.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, first permit me to express my appreciation to the Committee on Agriculture for the report of H. R. 4521 to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948. As has already been brought out here by many of my colleagues, this extension continues in force and effect the Sugar Act that has worked out satisfactory to all parties concerned. Prior to 1934, and for many years in the development of the sugar industry in the United States, it was in an unstable condition, but after 1934, as has been demonstrated, the people have been able to work out a fair and equitable manner and method of solving this problem.

Since the adoption of the original act in 1934 and the various amendments that have been added thereto, we have

been assured of a stable sugar supply throughout the United States. As this report accompanying H. R. 4521 amply demonstrates, there is a sufficient elasticity in the law to assure the consumers of the United States an adequate sugar supply.

In addition thereto, it has assured the industry of this country a fair and just return on their investment. Perhaps not in each instance does it work out fairly for everyone, but at the same time it gets us away from the chaos that existed prior to the time this act was first enacted in 1934. So we feel that the industry in this country has taken a great step and will continue to supply and bring to this Nation an adequate food supply in the form of sugar. I trust that each and all of you will join with us in the thought that this is good and needed legislation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the prompt enactment of H. R. 4521 is important not only to all segments of the sugar industry but to the American consumer as well. It will insure an adequate supply of sugar at a reasonable price for at least another 5 years. This will embrace the period of the present emergency and for that reason is a step that is important to the present program of remobilization. The present law—the Sugar Act of 1948—expires on December 31, 1952. This bill would extend the law until December 31, 1956, with some amendments. Among the latter is an increase in the quota for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and some of the so-called full duty countries. The changes in the law by and large do not alter the policy that prevails at the present time and represents more adjustments that have been necessary by the trend of the times in order that the policy be perpetuated. The quota allowed the Territory of Hawaii and other American producers remains the same.

We of Hawaii are strongly in favor of the prompt enactment of this bill in order that our production that is now reaching one of its highest peaks may continue with the assurance that the high standards achieved in our islands can be sustained and our product will find a ready market.

Sugar is an essential food. It finds its way into our diet in many indirect forms. Besides being used on the dining table to sweeten any number of dishes that are part of our daily diet, it is one of the essential ingredients of most soft drinks, candy, cookies, and cakes.

Close to 50 percent of the sugar used in this country is consumed by the so-called industrial users of sugar, who manufacture these products. Then, sugar is and always has been valuable as a preservative.

It may be said without fear of contradiction that this is a product that finds its way in one form or another into every grocery store, to nearly every food store and to all but a few homes in our country. The welfare of the industry is, therefore, of very great importance to the American consumer.

We have never produced in this country all of the sugar that we have consumed. Some sugar has always had to be imported. Most of it has come from tropical countries that are adapted to the production of cane sugar.

But at no time have we been completely dependent upon foreign countries for our sugar and at no time should we allow ourselves to fall into this position. Experience has shown only too well that when we become dependent for an essential product upon a foreign country we immediately invite higher prices and onerous restrictions. This is especially true when the products come from countries with absentee landlordism and without the restrictions against monopolistic practices that prevail in this country.

The most notorious experience of this kind was with raw rubber prior to World War II—a problem we have met by the production of synthetic rubber in what we like now to call the American rubber industry. The Sugar Act of 1943 aims to protect the consumer against just such an eventuality. It provides conditions under which production of sugar can be sustained in this country under standards that are consistent with the American way of life and, at the same time, makes it possible for an additional amount of sugar to be imported so as to insure the consumer an adequate supply at a reasonable price.

Without protection the American producers cannot survive the competition of other countries where most of the sugar of the world is produced. The principal reasons for this are the low standard of wages prevailing in these countries. Although national conditions for producing sugar in some of them may be considered more advantageous than in American producing areas, the fact remains that in none of them have the same high standards been achieved.

Long experience has amply demonstrated the soundness of this protection as a national policy. For many years the tariff served this purpose. But in the years following the depression in 1929 it failed and, in consequence, the present system of quotas was adopted in the Jones-Costigan Act of 1934. Without the safeguards of this law and those that have continued it, the production of sugar under the American flag could very readily have disappeared within a few years and the American consumer would be at the mercy of foreign producers whose standards of wages and working conditions are notoriously low.

The provision of the original law limiting the amount of sugar that can be refined in Hawaii to approximately the amount that is consumed in the Territory is still in the law and is as objectionable to us of Hawaii today as it was at the time of its adoption.

It is wrong in principle to deny a Territory that is an integral part of the country the right to market its product in the form it chooses. It is a residue of the old and now completely discredited colonial system under which the so-called mother country imported raw material from its colonies and reserved for itself the privilege of manufacturing this material into the finished product and

marketing it where it chose and usually in the same colonies from which the raw material was imported. But I do not propose to labor this point and desire only to record and reaffirm our position because the practical consequences of the present arrangement are not now serious from Hawaii's standpoint and there are other considerations of much greater importance.

The refinery in California, where most of Hawaii's sugar is refined, is owned by Hawaii's industry. The question of whether this sugar should be refined in Hawaii, where new refineries would have to be constructed for this purpose, instead of on the Pacific Coast in the industry's refinery is a lot less important than that the present system of quotas be continued. The discriminatory section with respect to refining sugar in Hawaii can very properly be dealt with at a later time.

Through a period of more than 16 years it has been possible under the provisions of the law now on the statute books to achieve in the sugar industry a balance between consumers and producers, domestic producers and foreign producers, and producers and refiners, that has served well to provide the American people with an adequate supply of sugar at a reasonable price and sustain production under the American flag at constantly improving standards.

For many years Hawaii has been one of the principal sources of sugar for this country. This relationship had its beginning 75 years ago when the United States concluded a commercial treaty of reciprocity with the Hawaiian monarchy. This was in 1876. The treaty permitted the importation of sugar produced in Hawaii free of duty and gave the United States coaling rights at Pearl Harbor. This was indeed a significant day in the history not only of Hawaii but of the United States as the events of the last 10 years have clearly demonstrated. From that day in 1876 when this treaty was concluded the relationship between Hawaii and the United States has become progressively closer.

In 1898 the Hawaiian Islands by voluntary annexation became an integral part of the United States. It is something of a coincidence that the American flag was first raised in Hawaii on August 12, 1898, exactly 53 years ago yesterday. That flag had only 45 stars. Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico were still Territories. Hawaii became a Territory in 1900 by the adoption of the Hawaiian Organic Act that is still the law of Congress and under which we of the Territory are governed and under which we assume and have always met all of the financial obligations of a State and been subject to the same laws of the States.

During the period of the past 50 years, while we have been a Territory of the United States, the sugar industry has undergone great development. At the same time our life in Hawaii has become progressively more closely integrated with that of the rest of the country. Today our relationships with the rest of the country economically, culturally, and socially resembles those of a State in every respect but one. Politically, we are still a dependency with our partici-

pation in the National Government severely limited and will continue to be until we become a State. I hope that day is not far off.

The sugar industry remains today as it has for many years past the basis of Hawaii's economy. The interest of Hawaii in this legislation is therefore a very vital one. Hawaii is one of the principal American producers of sugar. Hawaii's quota under the present law is 1,052,000 tons. H. R. 4521 continues this quota. Hawaii will continue in the future under this law, as it has in the past, to produce about one-fourth of the sugar produced under the American flag.

I say without fear of contradiction and without undertaking to boast that the standards achieved in Hawaii in the production of sugar are the highest in the world.

More sugar is produced per acre with respect to the record per single acre and the average for the entire area than in any other sugar-producing area. This is shown by the table which follows:

Average tons of sugar per acre:	Tons
Hawaii.....	9
Louisiana.....	1.6
Florida.....	2.5
Puerto Rico.....	3.5
Beet area.....	2.1
Cuba.....	2.25

Average age of crop due to system is about:	Months
Hawaii.....	22
Louisiana.....	12
Florida.....	14
Puerto Rico.....	14
Cuba.....	14

Mechanization has brought the number of man-hours required to produce a ton of cane to the lowest point ever achieved anywhere. In other words, the volume of sugar produced by each individual sugar worker in Hawaii is greater than in any other place in the world.

And the wages paid to sugar workers in Hawaii are the highest in any place in the sugar industry.

These facts are graphically presented in charts prepared by the Sugar Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

The Hawaiian sugar industry has historically been a world leader in the development of new varieties of cane and better methods of agriculture. And now its scientists are turning their genius to mechanization. This has already reduced the manpower required to produce our sugar by more than one-half during a period of 1 year. The experimental work that has developed new varieties of cane, better methods of agriculture, and mechanization has been financed in full by the sugar industry itself, whose experiment station has won fame throughout the world for its findings. Hawaii's sugar industry is owned by the people of Hawaii—and they are American. With minor exceptions the industry has not suffered from the plague of absentee landlordism. Most of its principal owners are in Hawaii operating the industry themselves.

Production of sugar in Hawaii has been conducted on a corporate basis. It

is highly industrialized. This has brought great efficiency in production but it has also brought with it problems of industrial relationship that probably constitute the most serious problems that confront the industry today.

For many years organization of the workers in the sugar industry was resisted by management. The adoption of the Wagner Act brought about a great change in this respect. Representatives of the National Labor Board were active in encouraging the organization of labor and the more enlightened element of management accepted the principle of collective bargaining as the basis upon which future relationships should be conducted. The tide of this great change was stemmed by the outbreak of war on December 7, 1941. From that time until the end of the war, the people of Hawaii lived under the severest restriction and for the best part of the period under military government. But in the 5 years that have elapsed since the war the industry has been torn by bitter industrial strife. I introduce reference to this situation not only so that you may be informed of the present position of our industry but may realize how completely we feel the influence and the effect of Federal law. The people of the Territory, for better or worse, are controlled by the laws of Congress, although they are without the privilege of choosing those whose votes determine what these laws shall be and how they shall be administered.

I am sure everyone will agree that we are at least entitled under these conditions to the full protection and the full benefit of American law.

The standards that we have achieved are a source of great pride but they cannot be sustained without the maintenance of a policy of protection in the sugar industry.

We point with pride to the high wages that are paid to the sugar workers in our industry. We are glad that the conditions under which they are producing sugar are constantly being improved.

We hope that means will be found to raise the standard of wages in other producing areas and favor any steps that the Government can appropriately take to advance these wages and protect them from the competition of low foreign wages. This is the American system.

We feel that the administration of the Sugar Act of 1948 by the Department of Agriculture has been well informed, fair and efficient. Some criticism has been made of it by those who would have this agency pursue a more aggressive policy on the question of minimum wages but we recognize this represents an extremely difficult problem because of the great variation in the conditions controlling production and employment. The producers of beet sugar and cane sugar in the States probably never will achieve the production per acre that is possible in Hawaii because of different climatic conditions, and in Puerto Rico the introduction of mechanization and a compensating increase in wages would only serve to increase the very serious problem of unemployment. We nevertheless set the example and we hope

point the way and trust to the perpetuation of the protective system that makes the continuation of these high standards possible.

We believe our performance is in the best tradition of our country and ask that in the same tradition that we continue to enjoy the full protection of American law that is so important to our survival.

We therefore strongly urge the prompt enactment of this bill.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'Ewart].

Mr. D'Ewart. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to correct a question, which I addressed to the chairman of the committee in regard to wool. I am informed, since I addressed that question to him, that I was in error. There was a loss in the wool program when the warehousing and all the rest of the charges are considered.

Mr. Chairman, sugar beets are one of the big crops in my State. We have five large factories, four in my district. The debate today has brought out that the beet industry is not quite as healthy as some of the talks which have been made this afternoon would seem to indicate. The acreage planted in the United States in beets is down 26 percent. That indicates that there is something wrong, perhaps temporarily, but nevertheless something wrong with the beet industry. It is the established policy, as is brought out in the report, to keep a sound sugar industry in the United States and to preserve the ability of this Nation to produce a portion of this vital product needed by the American consumers. I think that is a sound policy. But with beet acreage down 26 percent in this country, my mail indicates that that policy is not being carried out, at least this year, 100 percent. There are several reasons for that. One of them is the increase of prices of other agricultural commodities. I have here the average prices received by farmers for crops produced in my State in May 1941 and May 1951:

Average prices received by Montana farmers as reported by Bureau of Agricultural Economics

	May 1941	May 1951	Percentage 1951 as of 1941
Corn.....bushel..	\$0.65	\$1.75	269
Wheat.....do....	.68	1.96	288
Barley.....do....	.41	.99	241
Oats.....do....	.32	.70	219
Potatoes.....do....	.50	1.20	240
Beans.....hundredweight..	3.25	6.50	200
Alfalfa:			
Loose.....ton....	5.90	19.70	334
Baled.....do....	8.30	26.60	320
Cattle.....hundredweight..	8.20	29.20	356
Hogs.....do....	8.30	21.50	259
Lambs.....do....	8.70	31.50	362
Wool.....pound..	.34	1.15	338
Beets.....ton....	18.71	213.26	152

¹ Final on 1941 crop. Includes \$1.94 Sugar Act payments.

² 1950 crop. Includes approximate additional payment and Sugar Act payment of \$2.46.

Wheat is up 288 percent. Barley is up 241 percent, alfalfa 334 percent, wool 338 percent while beets are up 152 percent. That indicates that the relative price for beets is not in conformity

with other agricultural products, which doubtless is one of the reasons that the acreage of beets has decreased.

I have here another statement showing the average rise in price of retail sugar, between 1933 and 1950, from 5.3 cents to 9.7 cents which means an increase of 84 percent. The rise in prices of all food products is 143 percent. Certainly, that is another reason for the switch from beets, a commodity which we want to keep in healthy production in this country. The rise in sugar has been 84 percent. The rise in cane has been 170 percent. The average prices of field labor are up 393 percent in the domestic sugar production area, a situation which makes the production of sugar beets in the West, not as profitable as it formerly was.

I am not speaking here today to ask that the price of beets be raised out of proportion to other food and commodity prices, but I do think the time has come, if we are to have the acreage of this commodity that we need in the country, we must give some consideration to these growers so as to give them a relative price which will make them able to compete with other commodities.

Another reason I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress is that one of the principal products of our irrigated areas of the West is beets. If beets are not in a healthy position, it is going to be difficult for irrigated farms to return the cost and investment of the Federal Government in those irrigated farms.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'Ewart. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For the sake of argument, let us assume that the same conditions continue to prevail which have so influenced the acreage of sugar beets in the current year and that next year, 1952, the beet acreage again drops 25 or 30 percent. Assuming that, what will be the ultimate effect on the sugar supply for the people of the United States as related to price, under a proposal of this kind? Of course, the answer to that question would be that Cuba picks up control of the supply of sugar for our people, and Cuba being a foreign country can set her price.

Mr. D'Ewart. That is right, and the domestic sugar industry and the irrigated areas of our country will be hurt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Chenoweth].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Agriculture for its fine work on this bill, which should have the support of every Member of this House. I have heard of no opposition to this extension of the Sugar Act.

I wish to say a word in behalf of the beet-sugar industry. I can recall a time when the importance of the beet-sugar industry to the welfare of our country was not recognized as it is today. I remember that when I first came to Congress 10 years ago an order had just been issued reducing the sugar-beet acreage

for that year. Within a couple of years we were short of sugar because of the war, and were dependent upon domestic producers, both cane and beet, for our sugar supply. Then we began to realize what the beet-sugar industry really meant to this country. I am in favor of doing everything possible to increase our domestic production of sugar so that we can be prepared for any emergency.

There was a time not so long ago when certain high Government officials in this country were contending that the beet-sugar industry was not an economical operation and should be liquidated. I think this theory has now been completely repudiated. I do not hear these expressions anymore. The fact that this bill extending the Sugar Act for another 4 years is before the House today without any opposition is convincing proof of the importance of our domestic beet-sugar industry is now recognized by everyone.

Up until recently Colorado has led in the production of sugar beets, with more plants for the processing of sugar beets than any other State. Colorado has always taken the lead in promoting the production of domestic sugar.

We take great pride in Colorado in the fact that we have championed the beet-sugar industry. In Colorado we have the main offices of some of the largest beet-sugar companies in this country. We have always been looked upon as the beet-sugar center of the United States. For this reason this bill today is of tremendous importance to my State.

I am happy to join with my colleagues from Colorado, and the Members of this House, in extending the Sugar Act for another 4 years. This act has meant much, not only for the sugar industry, but also for the general economy of this Nation. It has been called to your attention by my colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL] that sugar, during World War I, reached a price of \$33 per hundred. Sugar has remained, both during and since World War II, as one of the cheapest of our staple commodities. I think that is largely due to the fact that we have had this Sugar Act, which has made it possible for all segments of the sugar industry to cooperate with each other.

We have the happy situation today where all branches of the sugar industry have agreed to this extension. Everyone concedes that this legislation is most vital to our economy. Representing a district where sugar beets are grown and processed, I am indeed happy to support the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In order to report out the bill presently before us it was necessary for the committee to get in agreement with the Interior Department, the Commerce Department, I believe the Treasury Department, Agriculture Department, the Tariff Commission, also with the farmers, processors, and those handling and connected with sugar production. They must have done a pretty good job, because there does

not seem to be any opposition to the legislation; and for that I would compliment the committee. I will support the measure.

I have in my district at Grand Island, Nebr., one of the oldest sugar factories in the United States, and it is still operating. There is an unfortunate incident, though, attached to the sugar industry in western Nebraska in that there are two or three factories that have ceased to operate. You may ask why that happened? I think part of it is due to the fact that regulations by the Government have gradually reduced the acreage of sugar beets. The sugar-beet companies will tell you that they do not have the acreage to warrant keeping the factories open, and I know that many farmers, small farmers—and I own an irrigated farm in western Nebraska—they have quit. My man says, "I do not want to raise sugar beets any more." He finds it is more profitable to raise alfalfa, bale it, and sell it, with less labor troubles and the weather conditions that exist. Then, too, the price of sugar from a calorie standpoint is much lower than other commodities that you now buy. The cost of sugar—oh, it could well be one, two, dollars more than it is at the present time to be in line with the other commodities that the consumer uses. So I think the regulations, and the labor conditions, and the whole group of things have seriously upset the economy in some of these areas, enough so that sugar factories have closed.

There is another thing that comes out of the raising of sugar beets; it is the pulp. I do not know whether it has been mentioned here but the farmers who raised beets in the past always used the pulp to put into the cow. That makes good feed. Beet pulp plus feeding produced fertilizer which the land needs. Instead of raising beets some of these farmers have gone to raising beans, they have gone to raising potatoes, because it is less work; they have made more money with beans and potatoes. You cannot blame the farmer for that, but it has done something to the farm; there is less fertilization and there is no pulp, so the soil fertility is going down. I am hoping that the time will come and come soon in this country when we will set our foot down and say to these great Departments, Interior, Treasury, the Tariff Commission, and so on, that we are going to raise in the United States all the sugar we can raise. We are 26 percent below what we could raise.

Another factor to take into consideration is the changed eating habits of the American people. The eating of the American people has changed. I checked with the Agriculture Department not long ago. Forty years ago they were eating 204 pounds of potatoes—Maine would be interested in this—today they eat 111 pounds of potatoes because somebody said potatoes made you fat, and the women and others quit eating potatoes. Then in the matter of apples, 40 years ago we were eating 55½ pounds of apples per person; today we are eating 38.8 pounds per person. Dairy products, 338 pounds 40 years ago; today the consumption is better than 429 pounds with the exception of butter. You but-

ter people had better ask the oleo people why butter consumption has not increased. In the matter of citrus fruit it has doubled or trebled because 40 years ago they did not have much citrus fruit. Sugar: I believe 40 years ago the consumption was 84 pounds per person; last year it was 106. Coffee, tea, and cocoa have increased from 10 to 19 pounds. And do you know how much food the American has been eating for all these 40 years? One thousand five hundred and seventy-six pounds of food every year.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to say that certainly the sugar program has not resulted in forcing the beet producers in the gentleman's territory out of business; actually our information was to the effect that the beet producers have not been able to reach the quota which they have been allotted, and there has been a deficit in the beet area.

I think in the beet area they did not meet the quota, whereas in the sugar-cane areas they just about reached the quota.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is true, but a great many farmers have gone out of the sugar-beet business because the support price on beans and potatoes made that crop more attractive.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. A few years ago a man named Henry Wallace came out to Scottsbluff, Nebr., and made the statement before a large number of farmers that they should not be raising beets in that part of the country, that they ought to get their sugar from Puerto Rico and Cuba. The next morning there was a life-sized picture of Mr. Wallace hanging to a tree, with appropriate remarks under it. The farmers did not like the idea that the raising of sugar beets was not for them.

There are other things in this beet picture. I hope that we do not give away our quotas and that it will be possible for new irrigated areas to get a quota to raise beets. Our farmers should be encouraged to raise a full quota.

I would ask that the committee give special attention to not only the price of sugar, because I think it should be raised, but to encouraging farmers to raise sugar beets instead of beans and potatoes, because I know sugar beets are much better for irrigated land. They should not continually just skim off the best soil in raising other crops than beets. I shall vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to know if under this bill if I owned 100

acres of land I can plant anything I want on it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You can plant?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is nothing in this bill that restricts the production of sugar. I did not say "the marketing of sugar." I said, "the production of sugar." This is a marketing bill, a marketing quota bill.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] if there is any provision in this bill which gives the Secretary of Agriculture the direct authority to set the price on sugar?

Mr. COOLEY. No; there is nothing in the bill that gives him that authority.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the chairman of the Agricultural Committee in that statement. That is what I wanted to emphasize. Here is a program which seems to be absolutely satisfactory to everybody concerned. Perhaps I should say substantially satisfactory to most everybody concerned. It works, and we do not have to give a Government bureau the right to set the price. It has worked for years and there is no direct price-fixing scheme in the whole proposition. If you were to take a vote of the housewives of this country I think they would tell you that sugar is as reasonable in price as anything which they purchase with which to feed the family to date. So there is something else to keep in mind in dealing with this bill.

The committee report points out one or two other rather significant things.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to quote from the bill:

By providing such supply of sugar as will be consumed at a price which will not be excessive.

Is that not price fixing?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I said, "direct price control," and I still stick to that after the gentleman has read that statement.

What fixes prices? Why, supply, the desire of a seller to dispose of his goods. You can get in an economic squeeze. The banker may call in your loan. You might sell beef cattle at 15 cents per hundred under the market price if you had to raise money, because you could not ship them to market. You will have to raise money or else lose your herd. When the Secretary of Agriculture operates the amount of sugar which can be sold in the United States in such a way as to bring about a balance between supply and demand, naturally that fixes the price of the product in any man's market; but there is no direct price fixing. Show me where the Secretary of Agriculture has issued an order to the producers at what price they should sell their sugar during the last several months, while this law has been in operation. Well, of course, you cannot produce the order. That is what I am emphasizing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. He does it indirectly. You are given a quota and if you go over that quota you cannot sell

sugar. He has a fixed price and determines how much is to be consumed, so he has the formula, and by having the formula, indirectly he sets the price of sugar.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know whether I would agree with that completely. He may have a formula. Suppose the farmers in your district decide that they do not want to grow any sugar-cane or sugar beets. What are you going to do about that proposition? Suppose the farmers in Louisiana, Texas, and all the 16 sugar-beet-growing States decide they will not grow any more sugar, then they have nothing to sell and they have to do something else, through the co-operation of some other country.

The committee report says:

Sugar is an essential food product, and it has long been the established policy of the United States Government—for defense and strategic reasons—

And if I had been writing that report I would have put in another item there, "for defense and strategic reasons and the protection of the pocketbooks of the housewives of this country in their purchase of sugar."

The report goes on—

to preserve within the United States the ability to produce at least a portion of this vital food product needed by American consumers.

And, I would not have used the language "at least a portion"; I would have used language "at least a very substantial portion."

Now, why do I say that? Going to page 4 of the bill it shows that the domestic sugar industry, operating under the American flag, as our distinguished chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has pointed out, can, under this bill, place in the market 54.08 percent of the sugar marketed in this country. That is correct, is it not, may I ask the distinguished gentleman?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And there is a substantial portion. There is the security for the housewives of this country, the fact that you give the domestic producers—and who are they? The American citizens in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the United States beet and the United States cane areas—the right under the sugar marketing quota to sell into this market over 54 percent of whatever determination the Secretary of Agriculture says may be sold. There is your protection. Suppose the inflationary forces continue to work. Suppose the war operations become much heavier and millions of our men are pulled away from farm and industry to fight wars until such a situation develops where the sugar growers of this country cannot produce sugar, then what is your situation? Then may I say to my friends who so often speak substantially in the interest of organized labor—which is certainly all right and I have no objection to that—you become dependent upon the low-paid, semislave labor of Cuba and other hot countries for the sugar that comes into this country. But, you will have no power to control the price of that sugar coming in. The

foreign producer under the foreign flag, where his own Government is sovereign, can sell that sugar to your housewives as they did following World War I—not during World War I, following World War I—at as high as 23½ cents per pound raw value, which means 35 cents per pound refined value at the retail stores. This occurred then because Cuba was in control of the market. It can occur again if we let our domestic production fall to a very low level.

That is why your Government should always protect our domestic consumers in having produced a very substantial percentage of whatever sugar is consumed, in this country, so as to make you independent of the avariciousness of the producer in the foreign country who produces his sugar at these low, sweat-labor costs and sells it at a high price because he can control the market in the United States by reason of the absence of domestic production of sugar under the American flag.

Mr. Chairman, those are the points I wish to emphasize here. Of course this bill is here in the interest of the consumers of sugar, in the interest of those who work in the sugar cane fields and in the beet fields in all of these domestic areas, and in the interest of those who have invested their savings in the machinery, the buildings, and the tools which are used by the factory workers to process and refine the sugar grown in the areas covered by this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN].

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4521, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, has the full endorsement of the people of Puerto Rico.

Sugar is the backbone of the Puerto Rican economy. Puerto Rico is a small subtropical island of 3,500 square miles. It is an American Territory. It lives within the tariff system of the United States. It buys and sells almost exclusively in the United States. Puerto Rico is as much a member of the United States economic system as Rhode Island, New York, or California.

Nature's laws make us dependent upon the agricultural products of our soil for our livelihood. Our position within the economic system of the United States requires us to concentrate on such products of a tropical soil as meet the demand of the United States domestic market of which we are a part.

Thus, we must devote our energies to sugar, which the climate permits us to produce; which the people of the United States consume and do not produce in quantities large enough to satisfy domestic consumption.

Since 1934, Congress has found it necessary to enact legislation to stabilize the sugar market, to protect domestic producers, so that they may be able to continue to produce, and consumers to the end that there may be an adequate supply of sugar at fair prices.

When the 1948 Sugar Act was enacted, Puerto Rico was not given a marketing quota sufficient to take care of its production. This hit us in the Achilles heel of our economy: 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951 have been years of anguish for

Puerto Rico. We have been faced with a sugar surplus above quota with no ready market for it.

I must express sincere appreciation for the able way that the Sugar Branch of the Department of Agriculture has aided Puerto Rico over this difficult period. They have extended themselves to the utmost to find ways to help us. Now when the 1948 law is to be continued, the administration, after careful study and consideration of all factors concerned, has recommended an increase in Puerto Rico's quota. It does not take care of Puerto Rico's full production, but it certainly helps, and it will give the island's people a greater sense of security as to their economic future. Puerto Rico is grateful to the Committee on Agriculture for its unanimous recommendation for this increase as embodied in the bill.

Still, there is an aspect of the 1948 Sugar Act that stems from the original sugar legislation of 1934, which under H. R. 4521 will be extended for 4 more years, and which we consider to be eminently unfair to Puerto Rico. I refer to a quantitative restriction imposed on trade between Puerto Rico and the mainland. Under the Sugar Act, Puerto Rico is not permitted to market its quota sugar in the mainland as refined sugar, except in fractional amount. This violates the principle of free trade, as it exists in interstate commerce, and has been intended to exist between Puerto Rico and the mainland, since Puerto Rico was first organized under law of Congress in 1900. Since 1900 Puerto Rico has been incorporated into the tariff system of the United States. This should call for unhampered trade with the mainland. Being within the tariff system we are practically cut off from foreign trade. Under the refined-sugar restriction we are also curtailed in our free trade within the economic system of the United States.

Puerto Rico has 2,200,000 inhabitants. Ours is one of the most densely populated areas in the world. There are more than 600 persons per square mile. We cannot live on agriculture alone. We must industrialize in order to survive. No industry is more natural to us than the refinement of our own sugar which in turn is our main product. Yet we are prevented from doing this by Federal law.

H. R. 4521 does not alter the provision limiting the refining of sugar in Puerto Rico first established in 1934 as a temporary measure. The limitation is now stretched four more years up to 1956. Thus, for 22 years, Puerto Rico will have been prevented from developing its refining industry and is forced to operate only 50 percent of its capacity.

The Committee on Agriculture very generously and in the spirit of justice, for which I wish to express my thanks, calls attention to this situation on page 14 of the report. I quote from the report:

The bill increases the quota for Puerto Rico from 910,000 tons annually under the 1948 act, to 1,080,000 tons. In addition, Puerto Rico produces and refines its own sugar for domestic consumption, currently about 110,000 tons per year. While the in-

crease of 170,000 tons in the Puerto Rico quota will not absorb the entire sugar production of which the island is capable in good crop years, it is believed that it will substantially improve the situation of producers in Puerto Rico.

The committee was asked to consider an increase in the amount of refined sugar which can be shipped to the mainland from Puerto Rico as part of its quota. At the present time, Puerto Rico is limited to shipment of 126,000 tons of refined sugar to the mainland. It refines, of course, that sugar which is used domestically, but the total of approximately 236,000 tons which is now refined in Puerto Rico, is only about one-half the refining capacity presently available on the island. Puerto Rico's quota of refined sugar has not been increased since the establishment of sugar quotas in 1934, and no change is made in the refined-sugar quotas in this bill. The committee feels that some adjustment might well be considered in the proportion of the Puerto Rico quota which can be refined on the island, but it felt that this question is a matter distinctly separate from the assignment of over-all production quotas, with which this bill is concerned, and it believes that this matter should be taken up separately and at another time.

These words carry new hope for the people of Puerto Rico, a hope we expect to bear fruit in the near future. With this new hope, and, despite the fact that H. R. 4521 does not entirely meet our expectations, or solve this important problem of sugar refining, I say again that the people of Puerto Rico endorse the bill. We believe it an important step in the right direction and we pray that it be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1948 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 202. Whenever a determination is made, pursuant to section 201, of the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers, the Secretary shall establish quotas, or revise existing quotas (a) for—

"Domestic sugar-producing areas, by apportioning among such areas 4,444,000 short tons, raw value, as follows:

"Area	Short tons, raw value
Domestic beet sugar.....	1,800,000
Mainland cane sugar.....	500,000
Hawaii.....	1,052,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,080,000
Virgin Islands.....	12,000

"(b) For the Republic of the Philippines, in the amount of 952,000 short tons of sugar as specified in section 211 of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946.

"(c) For foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating among such countries an amount of sugar, raw value, equal to the amount determined pursuant to section 201 less the sum of the quotas established pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, on the following basis:

"Area	Percent
Cuba.....	96
Foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines.....	4

"Ninety-five percent of the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines shall be prorated among such countries on the basis of the average amount imported from each such country within the quotas established for the years 1948, 1949, and 1950, except that a

separate proration need not be established for any country which entered less than 2 percent of the average importations within the quotas for such years. The amount of the quota not so prorated may be filled by countries not receiving separate prorations, but no such country shall enter an amount pursuant to this subsection in excess of 1 percent of the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines.

"(d) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this title II, the minimum quota established for Cuba, including increases resulting from deficits determined pursuant to section 204 (a), shall not be less than the following:

"(1) Twenty-eight and six-tenths percent of the amount of sugar determined under section 201 when such amount is 7,400,000 short tons or less; and

"(2) Two million one hundred and sixteen thousand short tons, when the amount of sugar determined under section 201 is more than 7,400,000 short tons.

"The quotas for domestic sugar-producing areas, established pursuant to the other provisions of this title II, shall be reduced pro rata by such amounts as may be required to establish such minimum quota for Cuba."

Committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "existing", strike out "quotas (a) for" and insert "quotas—
"(a) For."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, after line 12, strike out the word "Area" and insert "Country."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 204 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugar beets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any area will be unable to market the quota for such area. If the Secretary finds that any domestic area or Cuba will be unable to market the quota for such area, he shall revise the quotas for the domestic areas and Cuba by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined to the other such areas on the basis of the quotas then in effect. If the Secretary finds that the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to market the quota for such area, he shall revise the quotas for Cuba and foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined, as follows:

"To Cuba, 96 percent; and

"To foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines, 4 percent.

If the Secretary finds that foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines cannot fill the quota for such area, he shall increase the quota for Cuba by an amount equal to the deficit.

"Whenever the Secretary finds that any area will be unable to fill its proration of any such deficit, he may apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such areas as he determines is required to fill such deficit.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary finds that any country will be unable to fill the proration to such country of the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic

of the Philippines established under section 202 (c), or that any part of such proration has not been filled on September 1 of the calendar year, he may apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such countries as he determines is required to fill such proration.

"(c) The quota or applicable proration for any domestic area, the Republic of the Philippines, Cuba, or other foreign countries as established under the provisions of section 202 shall not be reduced by reason of any determination of a deficit existing in any calendar year under the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section."

SEC. 3. Section 207 of such act is amended by adding a new subsection (h) as follows:

"(h) The quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines may be filled by direct-consumption sugar only to the extent of 1.36 percent of the amount of sugar determined pursuant to section 201 less the sum of the quotas established in subsections (a) and (b) of section 202: *Provided*, That each such country shall be permitted to enter an amount of direct-consumption sugar not less than the average amount entered by it during the years 1948, 1949, and 1950."

Committee amendment:

Page 5, line 3, insert:

"SEC. 4. Section 208 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 208. Quotas for liquid sugar for foreign countries for each calendar year are hereby established as follows:

"In terms of wine
gallons of 72 percent
total sugar content

"Country:

"Cuba	7,970,558
Dominican Republic.....	830,894
British West Indies	300,000
Other foreign countries....	0"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture knows, I am very much interested in this section of the bill in behalf of an importer of molasses in my district, who imports in small quantities from the British West Indies and Barbados. As is stated in the committee report, these importations presented a problem due to the fact that it is impracticable, for technical reasons—or at least very difficult—to have importations of molasses comply with the existing law as to soluble nonsugar solids. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture gave very fair consideration to this problem as it affects my constituent and other importers of molasses. I am not at all sure that this is the best possible solution under all the circumstances, but it is certainly a fair recognition of the problem and a fair effort to deal with it, and I wish to express my personal gratitude to the committee.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether the reference to quotas for the British West Indies is not in fact almost entirely taken up by importations from Barbados.

Mr. COOLEY. I think that is correct. It is meant almost entirely for Barbados molasses.

Mr. HALE. I think the British West Indies would not include British Guiana. I do not know whether there are any importations from British Guiana. Perhaps the gentleman can inform me

whether that was any factor in the consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. I think our information was to the effect that this entire provision would be for Barbados molasses.

Mr. HALE. I am very grateful to the chairman and to the committee for their consideration. I think this provision of the bill is a salutary one.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 411 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 411. The powers vested in the Secretary under this Act shall terminate on December 31, 1956, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1956 and previous crop years."

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 7, strike out "4" and insert "5."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 3508 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of taxes) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957".

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 14, strike out "5" and insert "6."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The amendments herein shall become effective January 1, 1953, except that sections 1 through 3 hereof shall be effective for purposes of the determinations and regulations required for the calendar year 1953.

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 18, strike out "6" and insert "7."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is made necessary because the Printing Office failed to include one amendment which was adopted by the Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: page 6, line 18, strike out the figure "3" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely for the purpose of complimenting and paying a brief tribute to the Administrator who has so well, effectively, and satisfactorily administered this sugar program. I have served on the Committee on Agriculture for many years, and I am frank to say that Mr. Lawrence Myers presented one of the most comprehensive statements when he appeared before our committee that it has been my pleasure ever to hear in that committee. He has demonstrated an impartial and fair attitude at all times and has administered the law in accordance with both its letter and its spirit.

I think it is due largely to Mr. Myers' efforts that all of the departments of the Government and all branches of the industry have been brought together in almost complete accord with regard to the problems involved. As I recall when I first came to Congress the sugar indus-

try was in almost a state of chaos; you could hardly get one sugar man to speak to another; now they all seem to be as sweet as sugar and everything is going well. I think it is due largely to the magnificent manner in which Mr. Myers has administered the law.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I simply want to join with my distinguished chairman in the tribute he has paid to Mr. Myers and the splendid way in which Mr. Myers has administered the present Sugar Act. I am sure that every member of the committee was well impressed with Mr. Myers' statement which was one of the finest, I think, that was ever made before our committee by any Government official.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4521) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 684) to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production- and subsistence-loan borrowers, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will the gentleman from North Carolina kindly explain the provisions of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. I shall be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] for that purpose, and further to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. These two gentlemen were

the authors of two bills which our committee considered.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House passed a similar bill to this, H. R. 7268, last year. It was known as the Pace bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] and myself, introduced bills identical to the Pace bill this year. These were H. R. 2642 and H. R. 4077. The principal difference between our bills and S. 684 is that S. 684 did not increase the present mortgage lending authority of \$100,000,000 but left it exactly where it is in existing law. Mr. JONES' bill and mine would have increased this authority to \$200,000,000.

ANALYSIS OF S. 684

The words "and insuring mortgages" and "insured mortgages or" in lines 6 and 7 of page 1 are stricken out so that the formulas regarding direct loans and insured loans will be different. Lines 3 to 11, page 2, sets up a new formula in the case of insured loans.

Under the present law, both direct and insured loans are made with reference to farm population and prevalence of tenancy in the various States. With this amendment, direct loans will continue to be made on this basis. With respect to insured loans, however, one-quarter or \$25,000,000 of present \$100,000,000 insurance authority will be distributed to the various States and Territories based on applications and without regard to the farm population or prevalence of tenancy formula. This change in the law is necessary in order to enable some of the Western States where farm tenancy population ratio is low, to take advantage of the act.

Section 2: Section 2 relates to operating loans and makes four changes in the present law.

First. It raises the limit on the amount of initial operating loans from \$3,500 to \$7,000.

Second. It raises the debt limit for such loans from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Third. It raises the maximum repayment period from 5 to 7 years.

Fourth. It raises from 5 to 7 years the period during which a borrower may be continually indebted for operating loans and still be eligible for additional financial assistance.

The need for increasing initial operating loans and debt limits on such loans are related directly to the changed agricultural situation. The prices farmers have to pay for items used in their operations have increased sharply in recent years. At the present time, \$5,900 is required to purchase the same amount of machinery and livestock as could be purchased in 1946 for \$3,500. Additional amounts are further needed because of the increased tendency to mechanize and to use fertilizer and soil-improvement practices.

The time limit is raised from 5 to 7 years because experience has shown that 5 years are not sufficient time for many family-type farmers to make and pay for needed major adjustments in their farming operations. This has been brought out by studies made by the North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station and by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

Section 3: Section 3 of the bill provides that in the case of insured mortgage loans, the Secretary may at his discretion delay his request for financing until the borrower has acquired a sufficient equity in the farm to enable the holder of the insured mortgage to refinance the loan on an uninsured basis under the laws or regulations to which he may be subject.

The reason for this provision is that many lenders do not have legal authority to make conventional loans unless the equity is greater than the present law requires for refinancing. This gives such lenders a chance to carry the loan after its insured features have lapsed. Where lenders are unwilling to do so, the borrower will still be required to refinance a loan with any other responsible credit source available.

Section 4: Section 4 allows discretionary authority to defer the initial payment for real estate or operating loans at a date not exceeding two full crop years from the date of the loan, if the Secretary determines that farm income sufficient to make the initial payment cannot readily be anticipated at an earlier date.

This provision is necessary, particularly when loans are made involving substantial land development or the conversion of a farm operation to a substantially different type. In such cases, yields are delayed generally until livestock matures or pastures have become productive or land development is completed. Under such circumstances it is unrealistic to require repayment within a period of 1 year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to impose on the time of the House by commenting on the pending measure especially after the very fine analysis made by the coauthor the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], who has just preceded me. However, I would like to emphasize the most salient points that were brought to your attention by my distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks on this pending measure by giving an account of the history of this legislation. Most of us no doubt recall that year before last, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, we passed an almost identical bill authored by Mr. Pace and myself which failed to be adopted in the Senate. This year the Senate has adopted S. 684 which is almost identical with the pending legislation in the House of which the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman ALBERT, and I are coauthors.

The distinguished Agriculture Committee has gone into this measure most thoroughly and has reported the bill unanimously. I wish to commend this excellent committee for the very thorough and punctual consideration that attended their deliberation on this measure.

Undoubtedly, the most urgent features of this bill are those provisions which amend title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act dealing with so-called production and subsistence-operating loans. Provision is made to increase the limitation on the amount of an initial operating loan from \$3,500 to \$7,000 and

to increase from \$5,000 to \$10,000 the total debt limit for such loans. Provision is also made to raise from 5 to 7 years the period during which operating loans must be repaid, and extend from 5 to 7 years the period beyond which borrowers who are continuously indebted for loans may be eligible for additional financial assistance.

There are two primary reasons why the limitations on the size and the total amount of operating loans need to be increased:

First, modern farming requires more extensive use of credit than in any previous period of our history. To achieve greater efficiency and security in the operation of family-type farms usually involves additional mechanization, increased use of fertilizer, additional investments in soil improvement, fencing, and livestock.

According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics studies, the total average investment, but not necessarily the amount of credit needed, for farm machinery and productive livestock on family-operated farms in four major types of farming areas during 1949 were as follows: \$8,941 for Wisconsin dairy farms; \$7,921 for wheat, corn, and livestock farms in the Northern Plains; \$7,487 for hog, corn, and beef cattle farms in the Corn Belt; and \$6,800 for combination cotton and dairy farms in the South. These figures represent the average investments, based on actual farm inventory values, for livestock and machinery on typical family-operated farms. They do not include annual operating capital needed for carrying out the farming operations. Since these figures represent averages for the farmers included in each group, they do not reflect the increased capital investments that would be required by farmers who have limited resources with which to start farming. Under the present loan limitations, it is necessary in many areas to limit operating credit assistance under this program to only those applicants who have acquired considerable equity in machinery and livestock. Many established farmers need to change from a single cash crop system to a diversified system in order to increase their incomes to produce a satisfactory living for their families, meet operating expenses, fixed overhead costs, repay loans, and maintain or improve the fertility of the soil. For many of these family-type farm operators to undertake successfully a sound, well-balanced farming operation, credit in excess of the present limitations is required.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the gentleman from Alabama, who is now addressing the House, introduced H. R. 2642, which was the first bill introduced in this Congress on this subject.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma concerning this bill. As coauthor of this measure I can assure the Members of the House that it has been a rare privilege indeed

to have worked with him in the preparation and presentation of the bill to the committee and to the House. No one has shown a keener insight into the problems of agriculture nor has there been a more zealous advocate for rural America than my friend and colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

The second reason why the limitations on the size and total amount of operating loans need to be increased is because prices which farmers have to pay for the items used in their operations have increased sharply in recent years and it is absolutely necessary to have more cash or credit to meet operating costs. For example, a farmer who would have required a \$3,500 loan in 1946 for annual operating expenses and the purchase of machinery and livestock would have required a loan of approximately \$5,900 for the same purposes in March 1951. This represents an increase of 61 percent. Large numbers of family-type operators are finding it impossible to obtain credit in adequate amounts for making needed improvements. They are forced to continue farming under a system which precluded the use of improved practices and the possibility of increased production and income which would be derived therefrom. Because of the increases in costs and the limitations on the size and total amount of operating loans which can be advanced under present authorities, it is impossible to provide credit assistance to a great many farmers who need and are eligible for such assistance.

The need for extending the present maximum repayment period of 5 years for farm operating loans and for increasing the period during which borrowers may continue to receive loan assistance is clearly indicated by the experience in the field of operating credit which the Farmers Home Administration has had and is clearly brought out as a result of studies made by the North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station and the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. The Farmers Home Administration records show that a higher percentage of borrowers remained on the program more than 5 years in areas requiring larger investments in operating capital than in those areas where relatively small investments are required. For example, in the Midwest where the pattern of farming represents a combination of livestock and such crops, 36 percent of the borrowers required more than 5 years to retire their operating loan indebtedness. The separate studies made recently by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis and the North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station also indicate that 5 years is not sufficient time for many family-type farmers to complete needed major adjustments in their farming operations. The results of these studies show that many farm operators cannot successfully undertake a balanced or diversified farm program unless, first, credit is available in adequate amounts during the adjustment period; and, second, the repayment schedule is extended over a sufficient number of years to permit the loans to

be repaid from the increased returns which materialize only after the improvement program is well under way.

I would like to comment briefly on the section of the bill which would authorize the deferment of initial annual payment for a period not exceeding two full crop years from the date of the loan in those instances where it is determined that anticipated farm income will not be sufficient to make the initial payment at an earlier date. This applies to both real estate and operating loans. Under present law, the repayment schedule must provide for annual repayments beginning with the year in which the loan is made. In assisting farmers in making major adjustments in their farming operations and in helping beginning farmers to become established to carry on sound operations, it is often found that the continuing costs exceed returns for the first 2 years when relatively large investments are needed in real estate improvements, and also in machinery, livestock and fencing. In many instances borrowers will not have sufficient income to make any repayments until the end of the second year. The present requirement that annual repayments be made on loans advanced by the Farmers Home Administration beginning with the year in which the loan is made presents a difficult problem in the administration of the operating loan program.

Title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act presently requires that when a borrower has acquired sufficient equity in his farm to obtain a loan on a non-insured basis, the Secretary will require that the loan be refinanced. Some investors in insured farm mortgages make the initial loan with the purpose in mind of observing the progress of the borrower until such time as his equity in the farm is sufficient to enable the insured lender to take over the loan without the benefit of Government insurance. At present, such a lender, because of the legal requirements under which he operates, might find himself unable to take a loan on a noninsured basis. The final provision of this pending bill is intended to permit the holder of an insured mortgage to retain the mortgage under certain circumstances until he can take it over on a noninsured basis under the legal requirements under which he operates. The proposed amendment is considered desirable in maintaining good working relationship with lenders who desire to convert insured mortgages to conventional type real estate loans. The borrower will continue to have the option of selecting a lender of his own choosing at any time that he is able to obtain a loan from a private source.

The present production goals set for the farms throughout the country as part of our defense efforts are being accomplished magnificently as attested by recent crop reports. The farm people of America have again demonstrated their patriotism by producing in abundance the food and fiber so vitally needed. The enactment of this bill will assist them in continuing this record of production and will, at the same time, provide a sound and constructive farm credit for their future welfare.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I favor the bill before us, S. 684, which follows the principles enunciated by the bills introduced in the House by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], both of whom are entitled to the thanks of this House for bringing here a bill that is so just in its merits and is so badly needed by the farmers of America at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I favor this bill and hope that the House will pass it unanimously. It provides that a qualified farmer may initially borrow, as an operating loan for his farm, up to \$7,000. The present law provides a limitation of \$3,500 for the first loan. This figure was fixed several years ago and does not reflect the increasing costs of the materials, equipment, and supplies that go today toward making an efficient farm-operating unit.

The bill goes further and provides that the total debt limit on production loans be raised from the present figure of \$5,000 to \$10,000. The wisdom of this provision is borne out when we realize that the cost of the average farm in the Southeast today is about \$6,800 and this does not include money for operating costs.

A third very important provision of the bill is that it extends from 5 to 7 years the period during which one of these operating loans must be repaid and provides that the Government may, in the light of existing conditions, allow to a farmer indebted to it under this program two full-crop years before he starts repaying this loan.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent an agricultural district. The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama has the largest number of farms of any congressional district of Alabama, a total of 34,431, according to the 1950 census. Cullman County, in the Seventh District, has 7,744 farms, the largest number of any county in the entire State of Alabama. Blount County has 4,747 farms; Walker has 4,354; Marion, 3,718; Pickens, 3,441; Franklin, 2,909; Lamar, 2,657; Fayette, 2,581; and Winston, 2,280; I recite these figures to show the large number of farms in our district, and with such a large number it necessarily means that they must be what are commonly called small farms. As a matter of fact the average size of all these farms would be considerably less than 100 acres each.

No industry in the past 20 years has made more rapid progress than has farming. Crops have been and are being diversified. New crops call for new methods of preparation, methods that are oftentimes very expensive. For instance, the cash outlay in converting cropland to pasture land is ordinarily somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30 per acre. The South, and particularly Alabama, is a growing cattle country. It is suited to the growth of cattle, hogs, and pastures. The little farmer needs

credit with which to convert to these new means of earning a better living for himself. This bill will go a long way toward aiding him to obtain the needed credit.

Last year I was invited to meet with various groups of farmers over the Seventh District, in open discussions of present farm needs. Invariably, I gathered the impression that there are thousands of farmers in the congressional district which I represent that now have the know-how to proceed to a more profitable type of farming for themselves and their families. The question is where are they to obtain the financing, the credit with which to make this adjustment. This bill goes a part of the way, at least, in the right direction.

We have provided very favorable terms, both as to credit and for tax purposes, for industrial expansion, and I have voted for these aids, with the knowledge that the country needed its industry greatly expanded to meet the threat of the war with communism that hangs so heavily over our land.

The farm is the basic unit of our preparedness. For, it is on the farm that we must produce the food and fiber for our own growing population, and to help feed the allies who join with us to stop the aggressions of communism. Our farms must be made strong in the production effort. Credit should be extended to them to the end that they become as efficient, as productive, as these times demand.

This is not a give-away program. This is not a socialistic program. The loans which this bill envisions will be repaid to the Government with interest. The interest will pay for the costs of administration of the program.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sections of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (60 Stat. 1062), are hereby amended as follows:

Amend section 4 by striking out the words "and insuring mortgages" and "insure mortgages or" where they occur in said section and amend the last sentence of section 12 (b) to read as follows:

"With respect to any fiscal year, one-quarter of the amount available for insurance, commitments and acceptance of mortgages under this title shall be distributed among the several States and Territories on the basis of bona fide applications and the availability of farms with respect to which loans may be insured and the balance shall be distributed on the basis provided in section 4, and preferences shall be given to mortgages executed by veterans qualified under section 1."

SEC. 2. Amend section 21 to read:

"Sec. 21. (a) The Secretary may make loans to farmers and stockmen who are citizens of the United States for the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the cost of reorganizing the farming enterprise or changing farming practices to accomplish more diversified or more profitable farming operations, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

"(b) No loan shall be made under this section for the purchase or leasing of land

or for carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program. No initial loan to any one borrower under this section shall exceed \$7,000 and no further loan may be made under this section to a borrower so long as the total amount outstanding, including accrued interest, taxes and other obligations properly chargeable to the account of the borrower, exceeds \$10,000.

"(c) The terms of loans under this section, including any renewal or extension of any such loan, shall not exceed 7 years from the date the original loan was made.

"(d) No person who has failed to liquidate his indebtedness under this section for seven consecutive years shall be eligible for loans hereunder until he has paid such indebtedness in full, except that the indebtedness on loans made prior to November 1, 1946, which are being serviced and collected by the Farmers Home Administration, shall not be subject to the limitations of this section until November 1, 1953."

SEC. 3. Amend section 44 (c) by changing the period at the end of said section to a colon and adding the following proviso: "Provided however, That in the case of mortgage loans heretofore or hereafter insured under this title, the Secretary may at his discretion delay his request for refinancing until the borrower has acquired a sufficient equity in the farm to enable the holder of the insured mortgage to refinance the loan on an uninsured basis under laws or regulations to which he may be subject."

SEC. 4. Amend section 48 by adding at the end of said section the following sentence: "The foregoing requirements shall not preclude establishing the initial annual payment at a date not exceeding two full crop years from the date of the loan where the Secretary determines that farm income sufficient to make the initial payment cannot be readily anticipated at an earlier date, but this provision shall not have the effect of extending the maximum term of any loan."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the bill H. R. 3880 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that the independent offices appropriation bill conference report?

Mr. PRIEST. It is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I understand the intent is still to bring it up on Wednesday, on the regular program?

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to amend the Rules of the House so as to provide that standing committees and subcommittees are authorized to fix a lesser number than a majority as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

In my judgment, this is a necessary reform in the Rules of the House which will strengthen House committees and subcommittees and facilitate their investigative work.

I think it should be pointed out that if this amendment to the rules is adopted it will bring the Rules of the House in line with the Rules of the Senate as amended February 1, 1950, by Senate Resolution 180.

This action is made necessary by the holding of the Supreme Court in *Christoffel v. United States* ((1949) 338 U. S. 84), and under leave to extend my remarks I will include a statement explaining the amended rule and the circumstances which make its adoption desirable.

I hope the House will act promptly on this resolution.

The decision in *Christoffel* against *United States*, supra, was a remarkable holding. We witnessed the rather unusual and undignified spectacle of Members of Congress being subpoenaed before a jury of a court of the District of Columbia to testify whether or not they were present at the time certain allegedly perjurious statements were made by *Christoffel*.

Article IV of the Constitution provides that full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State and that the Congress may, by general laws, prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.

It would seem on the surface that the records of the Congress and its committees should likewise be entitled to full faith and credit in the courts. A learned discussion of this principle is contained in an article in the *California Law Review* by Gerald Morgan, formerly legislative counsel for the House of Representatives—*Congressional Investigations and Judicial Review*, *California Law Review*, December 1949, volume 37, No. 4.

However, the *Christoffel* decision did not adopt the doctrine referred to above which would seem to be sound. Instead, the Supreme Court held in the *Christoffel* case that the Congress was at liberty to adopt whatever rules it saw fit for the conduct of its proceedings, but having once adopted the rules, the courts would review the manner in which those rules were observed, and that such observance was a matter of fact susceptible of proof before a jury.

The dissenting opinion in the *Christoffel* case pointed to the disastrous effects of the majority decision. It is to be hoped that when this matter again comes before the Supreme Court, the *Christoffel* holding will be overruled and

a better reasoned and clearer announcement of sound doctrine of legislative procedure will be made.

Nevertheless, under the existing state of the law there is presently available to the Congress in protection of its powers and the facility with which it conducts its business, only the remedy of amending its rules along the lines suggested in the resolution I have introduced.

Three things should be noted about the proposed amendment to the rules. First, it merely empowers standing committees and subcommittees to fix a lesser number than a majority as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony. Unless the standing committee or subcommittee takes formal action to reduce the number of members to constitute a quorum, a majority of the membership would be required. Second, it should be noted that the quorum provided by the amended rule would be for the sole and exclusive purpose of taking sworn testimony. A quorum for every other purpose of committee action would remain as it now is. Third, it should be noted that the amended rule prohibits one-man subcommittees by requiring that at least one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party be present to constitute a quorum.

The investigative function of the Congress is of extreme importance. It is the means whereby the Congress assembles the facts and considerations on subjects on which legislation is contemplated, and the means whereby the Congress observes the operation of the laws it has written. It should require no proof that there are many heavy demands upon the time of individual Members of the Congress. Many times there are important conflicting meetings which require a Member of Congress to be several places at the same time in the discharge of his duties. This makes it difficult to assemble a majority of the membership of a committee or subcommittee so as to constitute it a legal tribunal.

For example, the subcommittees of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, consist of eight members. Thus a majority of five members must be present to constitute a quorum under the present rules of the House. In the hearings which these committees have held in the Eighty-second Congress, there have been many occasions when less than five members were present during the taking of testimony. Technically and legally these subcommittees were not constituted as legal tribunals at those times when less than five members were present. A contempt of the committee either through refusal to testify, or otherwise, or through perjurious testimony, under the rule of the Christoffel case, could have been committed with impunity.

It is for the purpose of avoiding such weakness on the part of House committees and to give committees and subcommittees proper latitude for the effective conduct of their investigative work that it is necessary to reduce the number of members which will constitute a quorum for the taking of sworn testimony.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in said committees, and except that each standing committee, and each subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to fix a lesser number than a majority of its entire membership who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony: *Provided*, That such quorum shall consist of not less than one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party."

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain tables and excerpts.)

FLOOD CONTROL, IRRIGATION, AND PUBLIC POWER FOR THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the recent floods that have occurred in the Missouri River Basin, particularly in the Kansas City area, have shocked the entire Nation. It will not be my purpose at this time to enumerate those flood losses. We do know that there were a number of lives lost, that hundreds of millions of dollars of homes, plants, and facilities were destroyed or greatly damaged and that a great deal of precious soil was washed away.

Without detracting from the magnitude of the Kansas City flood we should also remind ourselves that very damaging floods have occurred elsewhere in the Missouri River Basin. The floods came this year, they came last year, they came in practically every year. These uncontrolled waters are not only taking the lives of citizens but are washing away our highways, bridges, roads, factories, shops, our homes, and worst of all, they are washing away the productive surface of our good earth which cannot be rebuilt overnight.

It might be said that everyone believes in flood control and water and soil conservation. It is true, however, that at any given time there is a lot of opposition to this. Most of us have to wait until the water strikes us to be awakened to the need for controlling and utilizing our water resources. In the district that I have the honor to represent 130 or 140 lives have been taken by floods in the last decade. The damage to property has run into the millions and millions. Our soil is not as deep or as rich as it was before these devastating floods. This Nebraska territory passed on to the State of Kansas a great deal of the water that created the Nation-shocking havoc of recent weeks.

In the First Congressional District we have had severe flood losses this year. These have occurred in the Little Blue and the Big Blue and their tributaries, on Salt Creek, and on the Big Nemaha and the Little Nemaha and their tributaries

as well as several other streams and at some locations in the Republican River Basin.

On the Republican, the Bureau of Reclamation has already completed the Bonny, the Enders, and Medicine Creek Dams. The Trenton Dam also being built by the Bureau of Reclamation is well underway. All of these Bureau of Reclamation dams are in the upper basin of the Republican River. The Army engineers are now completing the Harlan County Dam which protects the lower part of the basin. While these Republican River dams provide for considerable irrigation they are all important flood-control structures. They will prevent the reoccurrence of the disasters that have happened so often in the Republican River Basin. These are the major structures. There is an urgent need for a few other smaller structures to be initiated—namely, the Red Willow, the Pioneer, and a few others.

It is well to point out that the Republican River flows in at the Kansas River and that the Kansas River joins the Missouri at Kansas City. Water held back in the Republican River Basin not only protects us from floods and prevents the washing away of our soil, but it makes a major contribution in the protection of Kansas City, St. Louis, and clear down to the mouth of the Mississippi River.

When a spectacular flood occurs it is carried in the headlines of every newspaper. Its account is told over every radio station and the scenes of the disaster are carried on our television networks. It makes the whole Nation conscious of the problem. Sometimes when the news is turned to other matters a portion of our people forget the problem. Sometimes we forget that a sound water-control program takes a number of years to complete. Many people are totally unaware of the flood-control work that has already been completed or initiated. Because of these factors a multitude of suggestions are made.

Those who believe in big Government and centralized control once more suggest the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. They say that surely now the people of the Missouri River Basin will cease resisting the creation of the MVA. They imply that centralizing of authority, the creation of a large Government bureau, and the addition of hundreds of thousands of Government employees will stop floods per se.

What the MVA'ers apparently do not know is that the valley authority idea cannot be well adapted to a territory such as the Missouri River Basin. They do not know the problems of irrigation farming, they do not know what water rights are, they do not know that water rights and land ownership are inseparable, and very important, they do not know that there is already under way a flood control, irrigation, and public power construction program in the Missouri River Basin. It is successful, it is not failing, and what we need is more time and more money. It preserves the autonomy of the States. It is a cooperative effort on the part of the Federal Government, the State, and the citizens.

The Missouri River Basin comprises one-sixth of the area of the United States. It embraces parts of Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado, and all of the State of Nebraska. The productivity of this area is vital to the United States in both peace and war. It constitutes the most valuable physical asset in our Nation's economy.

Although the local planning, the promotion, the investigations, and the legislation for the Republican River Basin which is a part of the Missouri River Basin goes back prior to the beginning of World War II, the broad joint program of the Army Engineers-Bureau of Reclamation for the entire Missouri River Basin had its origin in 1943.

In the spring of 1943 the usual floods were occurring and threatening on the Missouri. It appeared that the damage might be very excessive. Representatives JENSEN and HOEVEN, of Iowa, and Representatives STEFAN, BUFFETT, and myself, of Nebraska, and others whose districts bordered on the river were in daily conference about the situation. The then Col. Lewis A. Pick was division engineer at Omaha. He was summoned before the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives. Among other things he stated that the Army could not protect Omaha, Kansas City, or the smaller towns and farms along the Missouri River with the dikes and levees alone, that we needed a broader program. A resolution was introduced by me calling for the studies and planning for a broader program for the Missouri River Basin. The Committee on Flood Control of the House passed that resolution. The Army engineers went to work and they brought in their flood-control program for this great area. It was based upon the idea that the water must be held back in Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Kansas if the main stem of the Missouri River was to be controlled. It was known as the Pick plan.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will recall that before the Kansas and Missouri floods occurred, the Members of the House who have districts along the Missouri River and also on the Republican River, where the gentleman is located, went to the Bureau of the Budget, and appeared before the Army Engineers, with a plea that some immediate work should be done on the upper Missouri River in order to hold back the waters which helped and assisted in the devastation which occurred in Missouri and Kansas; and that we were assured, especially along the Missouri River, that Fort Randall and Gavins Point would be completed simultaneously, but our plea to secure funds for immediate work and construction and planning along the Missouri River was refused.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I might say there have been two things that have held back the flood-control

program in the Missouri River Basin more than anything else. One was the stop orders issued by the President to hold up construction provided for by the Congress, particularly in 1947; and the second one has been that throughout recent years the Bureau of the Budget, which is the President's arm, has laid down and stuck to the policy of no new beginnings in flood-control work, whether carried on by the Army Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In relation to the time when flood moneys were frozen, I recall that it was on August 2, 1946, that Congress adjourned. The bill for flood control and public works had been signed about 10 days before that. The President had had a number of Members down there and passed out pens and said it was a great step forward, which it was. A fine flood-control bill. But the House adjourned on August 2, 1946, and on August 3, 1946, with a letter written on August 2, the President sent up a letter freezing the funds for this great project. It set back some 50 percent the work that was to be done; stopped it in its tracks. I was dismayed the other day when the President made a political statement, when he came back from the flood areas, that it would be necessary to elect some Members who believed in flood control and so forth. But the President himself froze at least 50 percent of this fund the day after the Congress adjourned. The echoes had hardly died down in this hall when that was done. He should remember that when he talks about stopping flood-control work.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I want to join in what the gentleman from Nebraska has just said about the work in the Missouri River Basin under the Pick-Sloan plan; that it had been unduly retarded on account of the direct action taken by the President of the United States in freezing the funds, as he did, as far back as 1946. I think the people of the Missouri Valley Basin do not have such short memories that they will likely forget that that was done, and are going to take with a grain of salt the political pronouncements of the President that it has been on account of the opposition of midwestern Congressmen that this flood-control project has not been continued. I would ask the gentleman this question: Does not the gentleman feel that, in addition to the reasons he gave, we should also add the fact that the Pick-Sloan plan has been retarded to a great extent because it has been approached on a piecemeal basis; we have been spending millions and millions of dollars to build revetments and levees, and retarding dams, only to have them washed out by the recurring floodwaters, and that has been one of the main reasons why the over-all plan has been unduly retarded.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Perhaps so. It is true that you cannot judge a plan until the major structures are built. That is something that the advocates of MVA forget entirely, that what we have constructed out there has prevented floods.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman knows that the district which I have the honor to represent has suffered because of the lack of flood-control construction along the main stem of the Missouri River, a distance of about 120 miles, for many years past to a greater degree possibly than any other district on the main stem of the Missouri River. I believe the gentleman will agree that that is a fact.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. So it has been a live issue with me and my people. About every other year at least we have had levee break-throughs; the flood waters coming down from that great area in the Northwest would wash away our levees and flood great areas. At this present time, right now, there are thousands upon thousands of acres along that Missouri River from Sioux City to Omaha and Council Bluffs, Iowa, that are under water due to the fact that our channel maintenance and bank erosion funds which the Army engineers have requested year after year have been continually cut by 25 to 50 percent by the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], the gentlemen from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. BUFFETT, and Mr. CURTIS], and I have done everything possible to try to explain why it was necessary to spend a little more money to safeguard these folks against these terrific floods.

This year the Army engineers asked for \$7,500,000 for channel maintenance and bank-erosion control from Sioux City to Kansas City. The Bureau of the Budget reduced that to \$4,500,000. I understand the Senate has not raised that amount even though a number of us who represent the districts, including the Senators from the States of Iowa and Nebraska, appeared before the committees that have the job to do of passing on these civil-functions items. But they did not heed our pleas; they have simply followed the Bureau of the Budget; hence the millions and millions of dollars of construction that has already been done has been destroyed to about 50 to 60 percent, to say nothing about the terrific damage which has been done to the farms and to property through the eating away of the banks, acre by acre, day after day. Nothing was done; it seemed like no one got excited until this terrific catastrophe happened farther down the stream.

There is something else I think should be mentioned, in 1948 the Congress authorized the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service to make a survey

of the entire Missouri Valley to determine what should be done in the way of conserving the soil, the water, and the timber.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman, but if he will pardon me, I am coming to that part of the program a little later, and I would be glad to have him make his observation at that time.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the country; for, certainly, unless we hold the water in the upper reaches of the Missouri Valley we may expect another flood of as great or even greater degree than that which has just recently happened in Kansas City and Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Several have mentioned the action of the Bureau of the Budget. That has operated against flood control in two ways. When the budget says no new project starts, it curtails funds, it makes it next to impossible to get more money from the Congress; but in other parts of it the budget allocates billions and billions of

dollars to be spread around the world. So that it not only holds back what needs to be done here, but it takes the available tax money and allocates it elsewhere.

I want to get back to the legislative history of this program.

The following year the flood-control committee of which I was a member favorably reported legislation to authorize the Pick plan. When the Army was making their studies, studies were also initiated by the Bureau of Reclamation. By the time the flood-control bill reached the Senate the Bureau of Reclamation had completed their plan. It was known as the Sloan plan. It carried the idea of storing the water far up in the headwaters—farther than had the Army. It contained plans for the irrigation of wide areas. Both programs carried plans for the generation of power. There was conflict between the Army engineers and the Bureau. Much of it was reconciled then. The Senate added the Sloan plan to the flood-control bill. In the conference on the flood-control bill the joint Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation plans for the Missouri River

Basin were accepted. The House approved the conference report and thus adopted the Sloan plan also. It has since been known as the Pick-Sloan plan or the Army Engineers-Bureau of Reclamation Program for the Missouri River Basin. Its initial authorization goes back to the 1944 Flood Control Act. Since then it has been expanded with new authorizations but its basic concept has not changed and it has gone forward since that time.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DEWART. It was also approved by every State in the basin?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Army engineers to prepare a list of flood-control structures that have been completed and those now under construction and those ready for construction in the Missouri River Basin under this program. That list prepared by the Army is as follows, which I have herewith inserted:

Comprehensive flood-control program of Corps of Engineers in Missouri River Basin

Project	Cost	Remarks	Project	Cost	Remarks
Projects completed:			Authorized projects not under construction—Continued		
Glasgow, Mont., local protection.....	\$22,000	Levee.	West Point, Nebr., local protection.....	\$128,000	Levee.
Fort Peck Reservoir, Mont.....	136,900,000	3,500,000 acre-feet. ¹	Waterloo, Nebr., local protection.....	87,000	Do.
Belle Fourche, S. Dak., local protection.....	37,400	Levee and flood wall.	Battle Creek, Nebr., local protection.....	284,000	Levee and channel improvement.
Schuyler, Nebr., local protection.....	74,940	Local protection.	Giles Creek, Nebr., local protection.....	414,000	Channel improvement.
Bartley, Nebr., local protection.....	203,800	Levee and channel improvement.	Havre, Mont., local protection.....	2,075,000	
Topeka, Kans., local protection.....	745,830	Levee and flood wall.	Harlem, Mont., local protection.....	69,000	
Forsythe, Mont., local protection.....	280,200	Do.	Saco, Mont., local protection.....	27,500	
Hamburg, Iowa, local protection.....	236,000	Levee and channel improvement.	Wibaux, Mont., local protection.....	42,300	
Mandan, N. Dak., local protection.....	644,700	Levee.	Beulah, N. Dak., local protection.....	118,000	
Hot Springs, S. Dak., local protection.....	1,240,200	Channel improvements.	Marmarth, N. Dak., local protection.....	19,000	
Council Bluffs, Iowa, local protection.....	2,595,800	Levee, flood wall and channel improvement.	Dakotas diversion (from Garrison Reservoir).....	35,000,000	
Indianola, Nebr., local protection.....	151,200	Levee and channel improvement.	Big Bend Reservoir, S. Dak.....	45,000,000	
Kanopolis Reservoir, Kans.....	12,167,000	397,000 acre-feet. ¹	Gavins Point Reservoir, S. Dak. and Nebr.....	44,900,000	165,000 acre-feet. ¹
Iola, Kans., local protection.....	22,290	Local protection.	Sioux City, Iowa, local protection.....	1,600,000	
Cherry Creek Reservoir, Colo.....	15,700,000	90,000 acre-feet. ¹	Pioneer Reservoir, Colo. and Kans.....	15,700,000	87,000 acre-feet. ¹
Total.....	171,021,360		Morrison, Colo., local protection.....	559,000	
Projects under construction:			Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans.....	71,573,000	1,600,000 acre-feet. ¹
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.....	278,195,000	4,250,000 acre-feet. ¹	Lawrence, Kans., local protection.....	163,100	
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak.....	197,300,000	2,500,000 acre-feet. ¹	Chillicothe Reservoir, Mo.....	49,841,000	
Omaha, Nebr., local protection project.....	5,745,000		Osceola Reservoir, Mo.....	88,163,000	
Harland County Reservoir, Nebr.....	46,730,000	500,000 acre-feet. ¹	South Grand Reservoir, Mo.....	18,304,000	
Kansas Cities local protection project, Missouri and Kansas.....	41,389,000		Pomme de Terre Reservoir, Mo.....	19,828,000	403,000 acre-feet. ¹
Kenslers Bend, Mo. to Sioux City, Iowa (including Miners Bend), local protection project.....	10,000,000		Richland Reservoir, Mo.....	26,874,000	813,100 acre-feet. ¹
Missouri River agricultural levees.....	124,837,000	3,500,000 acre-feet. ¹	Arlington Reservoir, Mo.....	21,508,000	590,000 acre-feet. ¹
Aten, Nebr., local protection project.....	500,000	5,740 acre-feet. ¹	Cottonwood Springs Reservoir, S. Dak.....	1,102,000	5,915 acre-feet. ¹
Oahe Reservoir, N. Dak. and S. Dak.....	269,600,000		Red Willow Reservoir, Nebr.....	10,017,000	22,000 acre-feet. ¹
Cold Brook Reservoir, S. Dak.....	1,937,000		Total.....	512,489,400	
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo., channel improvement.....	2,740,000		Recommended or proposed projects:		
Little Sioux River, Iowa.....	4,100,000		North Topeka, Kans.....	1,365,000	
Total.....	983,073,000		Lawrence, Kans.....	25,000	
Authorized projects not under construction:			Abilene, Kans.....	281,000	
Chatfield Reservoir, Colo.....	26,551,000	180,000 acre-feet. ¹	Salina, Kans.....	882,000	
Boulder, Colo., local protection.....	451,000	Channel improvement.	Marysville, Kans.....	221,700	
Erie, Colo., local protection.....	46,590	Levee.	Beatrice, Nebr.....	439,500	
South Platte River.....			Hubbel, Nebr.....	6,400	
Agricultural levees.....	24,351,000	Agricultural levees.	Manhattan, Kans.....	287,000	
Channel improvement.....	1,552,000	Channel improvement.	Fort Riley, Kans.....	69,000	
Greybull, Wyo., local protection.....	600,000	Levee.	Merriam, Kans.....	262,000	
Monarch, Wyo., local protection.....	194,000	Do.	Stonchouse Creek, Kans.....	126,000	
Dayton, Wyo., local protection.....	98,000	Levee and channel improvement.	Perry Reservoir, Kans.....	11,697,000	187,000 acre-feet. ¹
Sheridan, Wyo., local protection.....	1,906,000	Levee, flood wall, channel improvement.	Milford Reservoir, Kans.....	26,143,000	700,000 acre-feet. ¹
Buffalo, Wyo., local protection.....	520,000	Diversion.	Pomona Reservoir, Kans.....	9,078,000	155,000 acre-feet. ¹
Miles City, Mont., local protection.....	1,037,000	Levee and channel improvement.	Melvorn Reservoir, Kans.....	13,000,000	170,000 acre-feet. ¹
Norfolk, Nebr., local protection.....	2,213,000	Do.	Hillsdale Reservoir, Kans.....	5,924,000	77,000 acre-feet. ¹
Pierce, Nebr., local protection.....	174,000	Do.	Garnett Reservoir, Kans.....	9,865,000	160,000 acre-feet. ¹
			Fort Scott Reservoir, Kans.....	10,674,000	130,750 acre-feet. ¹
			Kasinger Bluff Reservoir, Mo.....	71,536,000	3,918,000 acre-feet. ¹
			Hackleman Corner Reservoir, Mo.....	10,745,000	212,300 acre-feet. ¹
			Stockton Reservoir, Mo.....	27,111,000	774,000 acre-feet. ¹
			Ottawa, Kans.....	975,000	
			Osawatimie, Kans.....	442,000	
			Marmarth, N. Dak.....	171,150	
			Rathbun Reservoir, Iowa.....	14,550,000	327,000 acre-feet. ¹
			Mystic, Iowa.....	29,600	
			Total.....	215,905,350	

¹Flood-control storage.

Comprehensive flood-control program of Corps of Engineers in Missouri River Basin

AUTHORIZED REPORTS NOT YET COMPLETED

Avoca and South Creeks and their tributaries, Dixon and Dakota Counties, Nebr., improvements for flood control and drainage. Missouri River, for flood control and allied purposes on Big Tarkio River, in Holt County, Mo.

Bow Creek and tributaries, Nebr., with a view to flood control and drainage.

Fishing River, Mo., and its tributaries, with a view to improvements for flood control and allied purposes in vicinity of Excelsior Springs, Clay County, Mo.

Loup River Basin, Nebr., with a view to flood protection at and in the vicinity of Broken Bow and Sargent, Nebr.

Missouri River, for control of floods on the lower Heart River and its tributaries, in the vicinity of Mandan, N. Dak.

Missouri River, with a view to flood control on Indian Creek watershed by the construction of a diversion tube to the Missouri River and a series of small check dams in upper Indian Creek watershed.

Missouri River from the vicinity of the Iowa-Nebraska line near Watson, Mo., to the vicinity of Leavenworth, Kans.

Missouri River at the Kansas City, Mo. and Kans., protection from floods of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad tracks and the Wabash Railroad tracks.

Lamine and Blackwater Rivers, Mo., flood control, drainage, and allied purposes.

Missouri River and tributaries, with a view to determining whether flood protection at, and in the vicinity of, Leavenworth, Kans., is advisable at this time.

Three Mile Creek, vicinity of Leavenworth, Kans., with a view to flood control.

Nemaha River and Little Nemaha River and their tributaries, Nebr. and Kans., for flood control.

Little Papillion Creek, Nebr., in interest of drainage and flood control.

Creve Coeur Creek, St. Louis County, Mo., with a view to flood control.

Missouri River and tributaries, for flood control and allied purposes on Nodaway River.

Missouri and One Hundred and Two Rivers, Mo., sections in Buchanan, Clay, and Platte Counties, Mo.

Missouri River and tributaries, for flood control on Platte River, Mo. and Iowa.

Missouri River, for drainage and flood control on Omaha Creek, Nebr.

Missouri River, effect of Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge on flood conditions on land adjacent thereto, and for flood con-

trol and allied purposes on Squaw and Little Tarkio Creeks, Holt County, Mo.

Missouri River, with a view to flood protection along the Sun River, Mont.

Missouri River, with a view to flood protection along Wier Creek and its tributaries, Missouri.

Weeping Water Creek, Nebr., in the interest of drainage and flood control.

The Bureau of Reclamation carries on a great flood-control program. Many people do not realize this. They think of the Bureau of Reclamation as operating in the very arid regions only. In the Missouri River Basin is the place where the arid meets the humid region. We have need both for flood control and for irrigation. It is logical that both the Army and the Bureau should be interested in that territory. It is sound that their programs have been merged and that they are jointly undertaking the job.

Mr. Speaker, likewise, I have had the Bureau of Reclamation prepare a list of those structures that have been completed, those now under construction, and those awaiting construction, which I herewith insert:

Bureau of Reclamation data on multipurpose dams completed, under construction, or proposed in the Missouri River Basin which have flood-control benefits¹

Storage dam	Total estimated cost	Cost to June 30, 1951, estimated	Total capacity, exclusive of superstorage (acre-feet)	Flood-control capacity, exclusive of superstorage (acre-feet)	Drainage area (square miles)	Location		Remarks
						State	Stream	
Completed:								
Angostura.....	\$9,420,000	\$9,420,000	160,000	0	9,100	South Dakota.....	Cheyenne.....	Reservoir will provide 60,000-acre-feet of superstorage for flood control.
Bonny.....	13,339,000	13,185,000	175,000	132,000	1,779	Colorado.....	South Republican.....	
Cedar Bluff.....	14,675,000	14,064,000	373,900	188,700	5,270	Kansas.....	Smoky Hill.....	
Dickinson.....	1,390,000	1,363,000	16,500	9,500	405	North Dakota.....	Heart.....	
Enders.....	8,400,000	8,340,000	74,500	30,000	2,240	Nebraska.....	Frenchman Creek.....	
Heart Butte.....	3,696,000	3,666,000	225,500	150,000	1,810	North Dakota.....	Heart.....	
Medicine Creek.....	7,006,000	6,930,000	92,300	52,300	860	Nebraska.....	Medicine Creek.....	
Subtotal.....	57,926,000	56,968,000	1,117,700	562,500	21,464			
Under construction:								
Boysen.....	28,222,000	25,959,808	970,000	0	7,700	Wyoming.....	Big Horn.....	Reservoir will provide 523,000 acre-feet of superstorage for flood control.
Canyon Ferry.....	20,357,000	10,530,000	2,043,000	1,000,000	15,860	Montana.....	Missouri.....	
Keyhole.....	4,394,000	2,846,589	340,000	140,000	1,910	Wyoming.....	Belle Fourche.....	
Shadehill.....	6,971,000	6,830,000	358,000	216,000	3,070	South Dakota.....	Grand.....	
Trenton.....	21,853,000	8,810,000	256,600	133,800	1,893	Nebraska.....	Republican.....	
Subtotal.....	81,797,000	54,976,397	3,967,600	1,489,800	30,433			
Ready for construction but awaiting construction funds:								
Bixby.....	11,015,000	1,143,335	215,000	125,000	1,810	South Dakota.....	Moreau.....	Reservoir will provide 768,000 acre-feet of superstorage for flood control.
Cannonball.....	9,025,000	586,773	245,000	165,000	1,410	North Dakota.....	Cannonball.....	
Glendo.....	21,935,000	60,000	800,000	275,000	15,550	Wyoming.....	North Platte.....	
Narrows.....	32,410,000	760,000	700,000	250,000	13,397	Colorado.....	South Platte.....	
Jamestown.....	6,455,000	65,000	230,000	200,000	(?)	North Dakota.....	James.....	
Lovewell.....	9,042,000	174,000	94,000	50,000	(?)	Kansas.....	White Rock.....	
Tiber.....	23,560,000	692,000	1,313,000	400,000	4,850	Montana.....	Marias.....	
Yellowtail.....	68,391,000	1,601,016	1,375,000	259,000	17,000	do.....	Big Horn.....	
Subtotal.....	181,833,000	5,082,124	4,972,000	1,724,000	54,017			
Being readied for construction:								
Ashton.....	10,500,000		99,000	4,000	(?)	Nebraska.....	Oak Creek.....	Reservoir will provide 768,000 acre-feet of superstorage for flood control.
Clark Canyon.....	6,030,000		204,000	50,000	2,500	Montana.....	Beaverhead.....	
Davis.....	22,960,000		250,000	243,000	92	Nebraska.....	Davis Creek.....	
Kirwin.....	13,975,000	355,000	200,000	105,000	1,415	Kansas.....	North Fork Solomon.....	
Lake Solitude.....	845,000		7,600	500	14	Wyoming.....	Paintrock.....	
Medicine Lake.....	29,518,000	93,700	5,442,000	0	(?)	Montana.....	Big Muddy Creek.....	
Middle Fork.....	6,880,000		120,000	60,000	480	Wyoming.....	Middle Fork, Powder River.....	
Moorhead.....	25,530,000	1,624,261	1,150,000	250,000	8,080	Montana.....	Powder.....	
Pactola.....	10,992,000	223,788	93,000	43,000	335	South Dakota.....	Rapid Creek.....	
Red Gulch.....	4,368,000		15,000	2,000	(?)	Wyoming.....	Shell Creek.....	
Weta.....	15,000,000		550,000	300,000	(?)	South Dakota.....	White River.....	
Subtotal.....	133,098,000	2,296,749	8,130,600	1,057,500	12,916			
Grand total.....	454,654,000	119,323,270	18,187,900	4,833,800	118,830			

¹ In addition to the dams listed below for the Missouri River Basin there are some 50 additional multipurpose dams under preliminary investigations in the basin which will have flood control benefits but for which detailed information is not available. It is estimated the total storage capacity which will be made available by the construction of the latter dams will aggregate about 17,000,000 acre-feet.

² Information not available.

Mr. Speaker, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are doing a great job in the Missouri River Basin. The soil-conservation districts and the

individual farmers have been doing a good job in soil and water conservation in the Missouri River Basin. A gap in this program has been recognized by all

of us for a number of years. There is need for a conservation program larger than the individual farmer or his soil-conservation district can carry, yet not

of the size or the cost of dams that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers would build. This has been called an agricultural flood control program. It is a soil-saving, flood-control, and water-conserving program that does the job in the area between the individual efforts and the Bureau of Reclamation or the Army.

This agricultural program is very important. It is important because of its soil saving and because it does retard floods. In addition to that it prolongs the life of the reservoirs of the Army and the Bureau. It makes our farms more productive. It involves small water retarding structures, tree planting, and other changes in land use and like undertakings.

The Department of Agriculture prepared a flood-control program for the Missouri River Basin. It was originally called the Young plan. When it reached the Department of Agriculture many other programs not dealing directly with soil and water were added. It became a big program, and it has never been authorized as one undertaking. I am sure that many of the people living in the Missouri River Basin, particularly in Nebraska and Iowa, feel that the agricultural small watershed programs are preferred to the broad programs for the entire area which are so involved. There is much to be said for a valley-by-valley approach.

The Little Sioux watershed in Iowa is the only watershed in the Missouri River Basin authorized for the installation of works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in accordance with the flood-control acts of Congress.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Let me say that the Little Sioux River project is almost entirely within my congressional district, part of it also being in the congressional district represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. JENSEN. That soil conservation program is the pattern that has been set up and is being followed throughout the United States and has been making wonderful progress in northwest Iowa. The only tragedy of it is that the funds have been so reduced that they have not been able to complete the job which should have been consummated many years ago.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. There has been wide discussion of the soil-conservation program which the gentleman has just mentioned, as well as of the Pick-Sloan plan proper in my State, and the discussion has taken a form that would indicate that some people regard the one plan as a substitute for the other. I would like to have the gentleman state whether he thinks the soil-conservation plan would or could serve as a substitute for the program of the Army engineers plus the program of the Reclamation Service, or whether the Army engineers' plan plus that of the Reclamation Serv-

ice could serve as a substitute for the soil conservation plan, or whether the plans should be considered as supplementing each other?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I can give the gentleman my opinion on it. I think the programs should supplement each other. In fact, I do not believe that with the best soil conservation practices and with the best flood control program you could entirely eliminate the needs for some of the larger dams; in fact, many of them. On the other hand, if you do not have the program on the farm extending clear up into the far reaches, at the beginning of the creeks, you will find that you will still lose your soil and the reservoir that you built on the stream will fill up much quicker with silt. They are both necessary.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that General Pick recognizes the need for soil conservation, which actually is flood prevention, and encourages valley-wide watershed programs of soil conservation organizations to hold the raindrops where they fall so that it will keep the silt out of the main stem and keep the soil where it belongs? I know that he does.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. And he is working with the Soil Conservation Service. I might say it has taken some time for everyone to get in perfect harmony on this program, this triple program of the Reclamation Service, the Soil Conservation, and the Army engineers, but they are very well harmonized. There is no difference, no great difference, at all, and the program is being run from the top by the governors of the 10 States who are elected by the people as against a river-valley authority where three men are appointed and run an empire within our great American empire.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct. The conflict between the departments is greatly overstated. It is an argument being used by those who would force upon the territory a Missouri Valley Authority. It is not supported by the facts.

In the last 10 years much progress has been made in getting the departments to work together. This so-called Pick-Sloan plan provides an ideal arrangement whereby the Federal Government has its jurisdiction and States' rights are recognized, and the States are consulted through these committees. That was set up in the conference between the House and the Senate in the Flood Control Act of 1944. I had something to do with it then as a conferee. It has worked well.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is my understanding that the Soil Conservation people actually state that even if their program were completely implemented there still would be the necessity for flood control.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think that is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That would be borne out, too, by the fact that the largest flood we have had in the lower Missouri was in 1844, when we did not have the problem of soil conservation because there were no farms in that area.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. That is right.

Mr. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. AANDAHL. I want to join with the gentleman from Nebraska, the gentleman from Iowa, and the gentleman from Missouri in stating that the functions of the three Departments, the Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation, supplement each other.

It was my privilege to be a member of the Missouri Basin States Committee for 6 years, and of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee for 4½—nearly 5 years. It was our purpose on that committee particularly during the last 3 years to encourage the Department of Agriculture to expand its soil conservation program in the Missouri Basin in order that it might supplement the work that was being done by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

I am very strongly in favor of the coordinated plan, as contrasted with Authority administration in the basin. I think in that particular area out there we need the long years of experience of the Bureau of Reclamation in irrigation projects, and we need the long years of experience of the Corps of Engineers in flood control, and we need the long years of experience of the Department of Agriculture in the soil-conservation work that is needed in the adaptation of farming practices to the needs of the valley. I think the coordinated plan is definitely the plan we want.

Incidentally, that plan is enlarged even beyond the three departments we have mentioned. On the Inter-Agency Committee we have the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Commerce represented.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making, and I certainly want to join with him in every word he has said.

Is it not true that all the Governors in the Missouri River Basin are for the Pick-Sloan plan and have been for the past number of years?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I think that is correct.

Mr. LOVRE. Is it not true further that as far as the Pick-Sloan plan is concerned it is a construction plan and not an administration plan?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. That is right.

Mr. LOVRE. Is it not true that as far as a Missouri Valley Authority is concerned that is only an administration plan?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Yes. The idea of a Missouri Valley Authority just does not fit in with our economy out there at all. There has never been any experience with a Valley Authority where you had irrigation farming based upon water rights owned by the farmer that were inseparable from the ownership of the land.

Mr. LOVRE. I want to make one further observation, that as far as the people of South Dakota are concerned they are definitely for States' rights. They are definitely behind what is known as the Pick-Sloan plan. This applies not only to the people but to the press of our State. I believe you will find the same thing is true with the press in the other States in the Missouri Valley Basin.

Mr. JENSEN. And the people.

Mr. LOVRE. And the people, yes.

President Truman's attempt to throw the Missouri River program into politics, through his letter to Phil Murray, of the CIO, is merely a threat held out to advance his program of concentration of power in the Federal Government.

The Pick-Sloan plan is a plan for construction of river projects while the Missouri Valley Authority is a plan for administration of the projects after construction. There is no common ground for discussing the two plans. A Missouri Valley Authority could not and would not expedite the building of the dams which is of paramount importance at this time.

Rather than playing politics with the misery of the Kansas and Missouri floods it seems to me that we should lend every effort to acceleration of the program already authorized by Congress which is now in various stages of construction.

Consideration of a switch from one program to another at this time can only retard the building of the dams which are so necessary in order to prevent future flood disasters.

It is my hope that funds provided in the budget for flood control and river development will be restored by the Senate and concurred in by the conferees. The recent floods have made legislators from all over the country more conscious of the disastrous results which follow when no attempt is made to curb the floodwaters.

In addition, recent work by Governor Sigurd Anderson and representatives from Pierre, Yankton, and Huron have helped to lay a solid foundation for requests for funds for South Dakota projects.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman's remarks a moment ago about the need for tying together the entire program of soil conservation and the flood-control, dam-construction program, is very appropriate and very timely. More than two-thirds of the State of Iowa drains into the Mississippi River in my

district. In 1913, we had a dam constructed at Keokuk, and if you want a prize example of the silting that comes from drainage into a dam without soil construction above it, you have it up there in the Keokuk Dam. It is badly silted in. It has destroyed much of the usefulness of that dam for power development. It is a continuing problem with us. We also have a serious flood situation in the tributaries of the Mississippi River along the Des Moines River. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], and I have been working on a dam project on the Des Moines River for many years. We have a problem on the Cedars River and the Iowa River. There is a dam now being constructed near Iowa City on the Iowa River in my district. We have the levee problem along the Mississippi River. We are constantly aware of the need for flood control. We have ample proof in the Keokuk silting problem of the need of soil conservation work upstream and in the tributaries. I commend the gentleman very highly on the breadth and scope and timeliness of his discussion.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. D'EWARD. I call the attention of the House to the fact that this is not only an irrigation and flood-control project. The Pick-Sloan plan also envisions the development of the mineral resources in the basin and the conservation of fish and wildlife, and the development of recreational facilities, and navigation. In short, it is a multiple-purpose plan for the development of all the resources and not only of irrigation and flood control work.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. It also includes power, which I have not dwelt on today because in recent weeks our minds have been turned to the devastating floods, and I wanted to submit for the RECORD what is being done about flood control.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. During our recent tour in Kansas, several tests were made of the Kansas River at the peak of the flood, and it was found that one-tenth of the volume going down the river was top soil. Specimens were taken at Kansas City, Mo., and Topeka, and at Lawrence. That is one-tenth of the volume going down the river was top soil, and the best of river and bottom lands throughout the Midwest.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska are especially timely now when we have had the devastating experience of these terrible floods. The thought occurs to me that any satisfactory flood-control program will have to be a long-range program,

and will have to have not only flood-control dams, but the dams will have to be supplemented by upstream water control clear to the point where the rainfall strikes the land. It will have to be done to a considerable extent by the individual farmers who practice conservation measures by terracing and contouring the land, and slowing down the flow of the water. Nevertheless, it never will be entirely solved by contouring and other farm practices. I talked with geologists who told me that in the Des Moines River valley undoubtedly there were greater floods than we have ever seen, in prehistoric times before the plow had ever been brought to Iowa. In other words, even the prairie sod saw floods down the Des Moines River Valley. It will have to be a plan whereby soil conservation practices and work will be supplemented by the dams built by the Army engineers along our inland streams. Does the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Yes, you have to have both. Farther west, when you get out into my State, we also have to utilize that water for irrigation just as much as we can.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Last year, under the one-package appropriation bill, as the gentleman will recall, the conferees threw out all savings which the House and Senate had made, and then they provided that the Bureau of the Budget should reduce the amount therein appropriated by the Congress to a sum not less than \$550,000,000. The gentleman remembers that?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I do.

Mr. JENSEN. What happened? Fifty million dollars was stricken from the flood-control item which the Congress had provided, and again the Army engineers' program was thrown into a cocked hat, and the Missouri Valley flood-control program suffered no end because of that action by the conferees.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. And we delegated the power of Congress to one individual, who was the right hand of the President of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The record is well established that the Executive, instead of leading the way for conservation in the Missouri River Basin, has retarded it time after time. It has been mentioned that the stop order was placed on construction in 1946. They held up an important dam on one of the tributaries of the Republican River, where in one flood we lost 110 lives. What happened? On the Saturday before election the stop order was released, and announced by the Democratic Party officials in Nebraska. That is the sort of difficulties we have had to overcome in carrying forward this program.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to join with others in commending the gentleman from Nebraska on his very thoughtful and careful consideration of this problem which affects nearly one-third of the United States; namely, the work of conservation, flood control, irrigation, and power production in the Missouri River Basin. I am especially impressed by two factors that the gentleman has mentioned. One is the thought that there should be some degree of local control over these problems which directly affect millions of inhabitants of the Missouri River Basin. The second idea, that there should be coordination, and cooperation, voluntary, between the various departments of Government that have to do with this big problem. I commend the gentleman heartily.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE. I want to commend the gentleman for the wide scope that he has covered with reference to this subject and especially to commend him for the fact that he has emphasized the importance of the correlation of these various agencies. We have suffered a tremendous loss recently in Oklahoma on account of the floods. The rivers descend through Kansas, on down through my district, and have created devastating floods. We are all in favor of taking care of the devastation, but from now on let us see if we cannot constructively apply the methods of flood prevention, even more important than flood control, rather than devastation benefits after the floods have descended and the damage has been done. In our part of the country we are not for the valley authority, but for the program which the gentleman has outlined.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. I think he has made a real contribution in pointing out that we need to prevent these floods. An inch of top soil taken away takes hundreds of years to rebuild.

But may I go on with my text with reference to the agricultural program.

The Salt-Wahoo watersheds in Nebraska constitute the only area in the Missouri River Basin where studies are now in progress leading to the development of a program of works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in accordance with the Flood Control Acts of Congress.

There are 11 watersheds in the Missouri River Basin for which resolutions by the Committees on Public Works in the House and Senate have authorized studies leading to the development of a program of works of improvement in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1936, as amended and supplemented. At present funds are not available for

carrying out the studies. A list of the watersheds is attached:

RESOLUTIONS BY COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC WORKS IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Big Blue River watershed, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Delaware River watershed, Kansas: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Little Nemaha watershed, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the Senate.

Nemaha River watershed, including Little Nemaha River watershed, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Salt Creek-Wahoo Basin, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Weeping Water Creek watershed, Nebraska: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Nishnabotna River watershed, Iowa and Missouri: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Boyer River watershed, Iowa: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Nodaway River watershed, Iowa and Missouri: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Indian Creek, Iowa: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Tarkio River Basin, Iowa and Missouri: Authorized by the committee of the House of Representatives.

Very likely the Little Blue River and its tributaries, and Beaver Creek, a tributary of the Republican River, will be added to this list soon.

Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, now Chief of the Army Engineers, has stated in substance that had the Missouri River program been built, it would have protected Kansas City from these recent floods. That program is under way and it should move forward. The Pick-Sloan program is a good program. It will do the job. We want the Agriculture Department's program, too. The Missouri River Basin should move forward with the programs already underway and outlined.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about conservation. Many fine speeches have been made and articles have been written. It is a subject that has been of major interest to me during my entire congressional service. One of the finest speeches on conservation was made by a minister of the Gospel. I refer to a speech by the Reverend John Fred Streng, pastor of the St. John American Lutheran Church, of Beatrice, Nebr. This speech was delivered on the campus of the College of Agriculture at Lincoln, Nebr., last January. There Reverend Streng said:

The church's people, priority, and prosperity depend directly upon soul and soil conservation. Notice the "U" and "I" relationship in soul and soil. So the church's basic institution for teaching understanding and appreciation of the soil, its meaning, capacity, and limitation, is the Christian home. Parents and children must learn to love the soil. Children are the most important bumper crop; they love to learn. We adults won't change our minds.

When little Ruthie dusts window sills and furniture, and exclaims: "Mother, I hate this old filthy dust," it's time for mother to begin a 3-minute rest period, and utilize

it for a capsuled course in soil conservation. Says mother: "Look, honey, that isn't really filth. God made the dust; it's part of our soil. It's our bread and butter. We belong to the land. If we take good care of it, it will take care of us."

Here is the heart of soil conservation, and the church's future depends on what her God-fearing members do to, and with, God's good earth in time. For, soul and soil erosion are twins.

Rev. Streng went on to say:

How must soil conservation challenge the church. Ninety-five percent of Nebraska churches are rural. And since main street is but the business end of a country road, we may say that all churches in the Cornhusker State are directly affected by changes in agriculture.

I like Rev. Streng's speech not only because it is sound conservation but because he drives home the idea that we should have dominion over the earth, that we should preserve it, and that we should hand it on to the coming generations, a little more productive than it was when we took over. His full speech will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, 1951, on page A1109. If I may quote further from that speech it is:

Volumes have been written on the scientific angle of soil conservation. The church must speak out in simple terms about God's glorious earth and His divine laws which govern summer and winter, sowing and harvest, rain and sunshine, day and night. God wants man to exercise dominion over the earth. And that's a mighty big responsibility. It's a high calling to preside over the mystery of growth in nature.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the others in complimenting the gentleman from Nebraska on his splendid address today. He has made a real contribution to development not only of the water but of all the resources of the Missouri Basin. I think he will agree with me that there is no difference among any of us as to the need for the development of these resources and the control of the water, but as to how it shall be done. We want it done by the States and the local people cooperating with the Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, there are those in and out of Congress who would make use of any event—no matter how tragic—to further their purposes of building a powerful central authority in this country of ours. To me, it is a sad situation when these people would take advantage of the flood disaster that has occurred in the Kansas City area to set up a Missouri Valley Authority.

On July 27 I addressed the House concerning this matter. I stated that under the Pick-Sloan plan for development of the resources we had made great progress in developing and controlling the water resources of the Missouri Basin. Water is the lifeblood of that great area, and growth depends and is limited by the control and use of water.

There is little difference of opinion between those who advocate an authority and those who advance the plan authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 as to the need for development of the natural resources of the great Missouri Basin. The difference is as to how and by whom this development shall be carried out. On one hand, there are those who would develop the natural resources by the State and local people in cooperation with the Federal Government. This way is consistent with our heritage and our republican form of government. On the other hand, we have those who propose a Federal Valley Authority. This proposal does not come from reclamationists or from those who know how to farm and irrigate land or develop the great projects which are needed. It comes rather from theorists in Federal bureaucracies who would use the development of this basin to advance their theory of a socialistic government. The authority people propose a powerful agency, superimposed over the State and local government, that would sweep away the rights of the local government and of the people who are supposed to be benefited. It would ignore the Federal construction agencies, the Army engineers, with 150 years of experience, and the Bureau of Reclamation, with 45 years of building such projects as Grand Coulee, Boulder, and many others; the Federal Power Commission; and the agencies of the Department of Agriculture. This involves a struggle that is as old as history: the freedom of the individual versus domination by a centralized bureaucracy.

Recently, bills have been introduced using the flood as an incentive, which would implement an Authority. There has been an effort made to give the impression that these bills have been changed and that some of the bureaucrats control in previous Authority bills has been eliminated. Such is not the case. The sections are being renumbered and rearranged; the salary of the Board members has been increased; the section which purports to protect water rights has been renumbered; a table of comments and chapter titles has been added; delegates or their designated representatives have been added to the powerless advisory council; a new sentence has been added to section 2 which purports to protect the interest and rights of the States, but contains the phrase "shall be recognized by such a regional agency to the fullest possible extent." In other words, there is still nothing binding in the recognition of State and individual rights. There are other changes, but they are minor.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that those who build these great projects—the Army engineer, the Bureau of Reclamation, and those who have to live under them and operate—the irrigation farmers, and the project managers, do not want a dictatorship such as is established in such proposed legislation. It is my belief that these people know that we have a plan for the development of the Missouri Basin which is sound, constructive, and in the interests of local

people. A living, growing over-all plan, the details of which are fitted into the broad pattern as our knowledge of the resources of the basin increases. The people who live in the basin do not want a dictatorship, but do want a part in the formulation of the plans and a share in the carrying out of the program. They want the resources developed, but in the American way. Sacrificing their rights as individuals and the sovereignty of their States would be too great a price to pay for this development. It is not necessary that they should pay this price. It can be done through the Pick-Sloan plan under which such great progress has already been made and through which development of the great resources in the years to come can be carried out by the local people and their State governments cooperating with the Federal agencies.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I hope I may ask the gentleman a question: Is it not true that we want to proceed with the program already laid out and not back up and start over with a new and untried agency in an area such as ours?

Mr. DEWART. If I am correctly informed the Pick-Sloan plan is the only plan there is at this time; there is no other plan in existence. This is the only plan there is. In fact the bills that have been introduced in this session of Congress recognize that and not only have provisions that propose to take advantage of already existing plans but they intend to use them on an authoritative basis rather than using the individual and the State in cooperation with the Federal Government.

Mr. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. AANDAHL. I repeat what the gentleman from Montana has said and what has been said several other times this afternoon. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that Congress has approved a plan for the development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin and any shortcomings in the accomplishments thus far can be overcome by making the necessary appropriations to complete the work that has already been planned and designed. It would be a loss of time, it would be abandoning a plan that is most acceptable to the people of the Missouri River Basin, and it would be most unfortunate to change plans at this time. All that we need is the money to proceed with the plan that has thus far been so well outlined. I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Nebraska for a comprehensive statement on a point of view very well taken.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, during debate last Friday afternoon on H. R. 4914, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval instal-

lations, and for other purposes, the following colloquy occurred and I quote from page 9821 of the RECORD of August 10:

The CHAIRMAN—

Meaning the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. JACKSON—

The Chair desires to state that he has recognized the gentleman from Iowa for five additional minutes. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to yield 10 additional minutes?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, give him 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be yielded some additional time at this time?

Mr. VINSON. I will give the gentleman full information about the Grandview Airport.

Mr. GROSS. Fine; that is what the public is entitled to.

Mr. VINSON. Grandview is 16 miles south of Kansas City, Mo. It was established in 1944. The field contains 559 acres. It was all under lease. Its planned utilization is in connection with the headquarters of the Central Air Defense Force, headquarters of the Continental Air Command, and one fighter interceptor wing.

Then the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said this:

The use of these airfields and for what purpose they are being built is classified. I cannot go into it in any more detail and I should not have read what I did read.

Again on page 9822 of the RECORD of August 10, I quote the following colloquy between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and myself:

Mr. GROSS. Why are you spending it there?

Meaning \$19,019,000 at the Grandview, Mo., airport.

Mr. KILDAY. I will take some time in a little while and give the gentleman as much as I can. We gave the gentleman some information awhile ago that was classified, and repeated it on the floor.

Near the close of the debate, Mr. Speaker, I was called from the House floor to the telephone and did not hear the opening remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] when he obtained the floor.

I now call attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] to be found on page 9837 of the RECORD of August 10, these remarks being read by me for the first time on Saturday morning, August 11.

I quote the following:

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected that there would be an allegation here that these various bases were located or allocated on any ground of political consideration. The committee, of course, was given a great deal of information that it cannot disclose on the floor. By that we do not mean by any means that we are not perfectly willing to disclose everything we have in a conversation privately to every Member of the House. We regard it as our duty to collect this information that we might be in position to make it available to you.

Here is the justification for the Grandview Airport: In the 95-wing program it will serve as headquarters of the Central Air Defense Force and Continental Air Command; and, as was disclosed by the gentleman from Iowa after we had shown him the restricted records, as the home station of one interceptor wing.

Mr. Speaker, I want this RECORD to show that on page 9821 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 10 that it was the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON] who told not only me but the other Members on the floor that the proposed use of the Grandview Airport was for an Air Force command headquarters and station for a fighter-interceptor wing.

At that time, Mr. VINSON said, and I repeat:

I should not have read what I did read.

Also at that time, Mr. VINSON offered for my perusal, a book which he said contained highly classified information.

Mr. Speaker, I want this record to show further that I did not then, or at any time on Friday, August 10, or at any other time, examine a single book, document, record, or paper held by the House Armed Services Committee containing classified information.

The facts as I have related them here, and as completely substantiated by the RECORD, show that it was the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON] who stood on the floor of this House and made public the information concerning the proposed use of the Grandview, Mo., airport.

The charge of having disclosed classified information is a serious one. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] should be very well aware of that fact since it was only a short time ago that charges and countercharges were flying thick and fast in the House Armed Services Committee, of which he is a member, concerning an alleged disclosure of classified information.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], by asserting that classified information was disclosed by the gentleman from Iowa after we had shown him the restricted records, has gratuitously impugned my integrity. Had I not been compelled to be absent from the floor momentarily when that statement was made I would have demanded that the gentleman's words be taken down.

I reassert that the attribution to any Member of the House of having divulged classified information is a serious one and I had hoped that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], upon reflection and upon his own initiative, would seek immediately upon the convening of the House today to expunge his statement from the RECORD.

Since he did not see fit to eliminate this statement in the revision of his remarks last Friday, nor did he avail himself of the opportunity earlier today to expunge his remarks from the RECORD, I can only conclude that it is his intention to let this false and unwarranted statement stand in the permanent RECORD.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I simply want to state that it is my recollection that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] made exactly the statement that

the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has attributed to him.

Further, that statement is in the RECORD. I recall very well that the gentleman from Georgia went up to the table in the well and deposited there certain books and invited the gentleman from Iowa to look at them.

Mr. GROSS. That is right, and the gentleman from Iowa did not look at the books.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct, as far as I know.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I remember the incident quite well because I was particularly interested. I remember the gentleman from Georgia coming down with a book and putting it on the table and opening it up. I also noticed that the gentleman from Iowa did not even look at it, and never did look at it.

Mr. GROSS. That is absolutely correct and I thank the gentleman from Missouri, who was present on the House floor through the entire day, for his discerning observation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to check with the gentleman from Iowa to see whether I heard correctly the page of the RECORD to which he referred. Was that 9821?

Mr. GROSS. The first reference was to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] on page 9822.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman read, I believe, from page 9821, beginning with the yielding of the time by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. GROSS. That is right, in the second column on page 9821.

Mr. KILDAY. I followed the gentleman's reading of the RECORD on pages 9821 and 9822, and I believe that he read the quotation exactly correct. However, I want to call the attention of the House to the language appearing on the previous page, 9820, in the first column a little more than half way down the page, where the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] had the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] yield to him, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] used this language:

I do not want any extravagance in the State of Iowa, simply because we think we ought to have something there. That is not the point. But this Grandview air base at Kansas City; that is a new base and it is to be a fighter base, is that not true?

That was stated by the gentleman from Iowa prior to the colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] as to the purpose for which the base was to be utilized, so that on the page prior to that read by the gentleman from Iowa appears his statement to the effect that the base was to be used for a particular purpose.

Mr. GROSS. That was not a statement, it was a question. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not yield further at this time.

I submit that whether framed as a question or framed as a statement, it was a statement or a question, or at least it contained the information as to the purpose for which this base was to be used, and that in a later colloquy between the gentleman and the gentleman from Georgia that was brought out again. I do not know at what time the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services may have shown the book to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. One further statement and I shall yield.

I do know that the gentleman from Iowa was permitted to see the books by a member of our professional staff, Mr. Smart. As to the element of time, whether it was before his first statement that it was to be used, or the question it was to be used for a fighter base, or later, I will accept the word of the gentleman from Iowa because, frankly, I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is being careless with the truth. I told him a while ago that I never saw a single paper, document, or record of any kind held by the House Armed Services Committee or anyone else. There is no member of the committee or the staff that can say that I ever saw a paper, document, record, book, or anything else.

Mr. KILDAY. I never said that the gentleman did. Perhaps I am reckless with the truth, but what I said was that I knew that, in addition to the occasion that the gentleman has spoken of, when the gentleman from Georgia showed him books, the employee of the committee, Mr. Smart, had done so. As to the element of time, I did not know, and I would accept the word of the gentleman from Iowa as to when that was done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman says it was not done then, and I accept his word for it.

I will not yield now. The gentleman had his 10 minutes and I want a couple of minutes of my 10.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Iowa feels, I believe he said, that I had made a bitter and unwarranted attack on him. I was quite surprised when I heard that statement had been made by the gentleman. I went back to the RECORD and read it. I must insist that nothing that I said constitutes such an attack. Certainly down where I come from our skins are not quite that thin. If the gentleman from Iowa feels he has been subjected to such terrible attack, I would recommend that he run for office in Iowa and not in Texas because this would not be regarded as a very bitter attack upon an individual. Our skins are not quite that thin.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the leak in the Committee on Armed Services. I certainly do not condone what

happened there. I resent it as bitterly as anybody in the House of Representatives could resent it. I do not know, and I would not make any speculation, as to who is responsible for it. But it was a totally unwarranted disclosure of confidential information, as highly confidential as the location of the radar screen and the air elements which are to operate in connection with it. As I stated in my remarks a little later on, the same remarks the gentleman read from, the information with reference to the radar screen was rather carelessly bantered about here in the House in connection with the debate. I am highly disturbed because we, in this Congress, are unable to consider matters of such great importance to the security and welfare of the Nation without the facts all being brought out and confidential information disclosed. I made the statements which the gentleman attributed to me. I feel I was justified by his previous revelation of what the base was to be used for. I stand on that on the record, Mr. Speaker.

GRANDVIEW MILITARY INSTALLATION

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, in asking permission to address the House, I have done so because I felt I have a worthwhile contribution to make concerning the Grandview Airport situation which was discussed here last Friday at some length. I am vigorously opposed to the amendment through which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] seeks to eliminate funds for the Grandview project. The vote will be taken tomorrow on this important proposition and it is my purpose today, by the use of some sound reason and likewise good logic to convince Members of the House to defeat the Gross amendment. The first good reason is that it has not been introduced, in my opinion, in a true effort to economize nor because it is not needed. Evidently, in the judgment of those responsible for the defense of our great Nation, including the Committee on Armed Services, this project is necessary to that effort. I, for one, have confidence in these people in the important matters of the planning for and the selection of strategic locations. I do not set myself as one of the few all-wise men here. It is not my thought in addressing the House this afternoon to malign any person, district, or any of the fine American citizens of any county or State. I feel sure the good people of our county of Jackson will resent deeply the unwarranted attack which has been made on their home county. While this airport is situated in Mr. BOLLING's district, which is the Fifth District of Missouri, and mine is adjoining, or the Fourth District, I still am very definitely interested in this matter. I conscientiously feel that it certainly would be a very valuable

adjunct to the defense program. In no way do I consider it would be useless, or that it is an item of extravagance. Quite to the contrary, I feel for the reasons I will give later, and I am sure you will agree with me, it will be highly useful and is an integral part of the whole program of defense. My colleague from the Fifth District in his remarks in opposition to this amendment had this to say:

It is a matter of regret to me that the proposed installation in Grandview in my district is being used as a vehicle for political attack.

After reading the various statements of the author of the amendment, and the remarks of others who supported him, I am sure no other conclusion can be made. If this installation had been in any other county than that of the home of the President, there is surely the possibility that no objection would have been made nor would it have been noticed by these gentlemen. I have the feeling that the interpretation that will be placed on these unwarranted charges, and this peculiar action, will be that it has been motivated by less sincerity than that of personal animosity toward the Chief Executive as well as the present administration.

I have never been one of those who engaged in bickering back and forth with other Members; and, Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to keep my record clear along this line.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very deeply about this matter, not only because of the apparent attack upon the integrity of a great many good men, but also I feel that perhaps indirectly I may have been almost solely responsible for this situation in the beginning because of my efforts in 1949 to have the proposed air academy located in Jackson County. I recommended three sites in that county as desirable and suitable for the academy. Thereupon the Air Academy site selection committee visited Jackson County and made a very thorough survey of the above-mentioned sites, finding Grandview as the best of the three. Much data and material was gathered by them, and additional maps and other pertinent information was furnished them by the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce and the real estate board of the same city. It is because of these efforts, inspired by my persistence, that I feel that the Air Force became aware of the value of this location in the very center of the United States. Therefore, in planning our defense effort they no doubt gave this site, as well as many others, proper consideration without any political or partisan influences being involved.

It is my desire to tell you a little more about the Grandview site in order that you may have a more accurate picture than was given you last Friday. I believe there has been already some millions of dollars spent there in its present development. It is on high ground above any floods that might reach it. It lies almost in the center of the United

States. Kansas City is one of the largest railroad centers in the United States. Many of the troops passed through there during World Wars I and II. I believe I am correct in saying that 200 passenger trains move in and out of Kansas City every day. A great deal of freight, as you can realize by comparison, is moved through this city. I think there are 12 transcontinental or large railroads which move in and out of there.

During the present flood there were two trains, exactly, moved out of Kansas City each day for a number of days. The Fairfax airport, which was occupied by the Army Air Force and used by them, and also used by TWA, which is a transcontinental airline, and which was very valuable in transporting needed material and military personnel during the Second World War, uses both the municipal airport and the Fairfax airport, particularly the Fairfax airport as their overhaul base. The Fairfax airport was inundated by the flood, and the municipal airport was very nearly so. The dikes were broken in several places, and only by heroic effort were repairs made which kept the municipal airport from going under water.

As far as the planes were concerned and the use of the planes at this terminal, it was necessary to evacuate it and move them to the Grandview airport to prevent their loss. The Grandview airport, which lies about 20 miles south of Kansas City, was used exclusively for air travel in and out of Kansas City. In fact, I think the President and a number of other high officials when they made their trips to the flood area, were landed and taken off from the Grandview airport. It seems to me that in the case of a great disaster or emergency, which could be a flood of like proportions to the one we suffered, or in case of an atomic bomb attack, this airport adjacent to Kansas City, and yet situated far enough away and on a high-ground position, would be of great value, not only to Kansas City as an international airport, if it should be classified that way, which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] seems to worry about, but it would give great value to the United States and to our war or defense efforts. He spoke considerably of Sedalia. I know not why. The gentleman apparently has been neither at Sedalia nor at Grandview.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. For the gentleman's information, I attended the University of Missouri School of Journalism at one time.

Mr. IRVING. That is not located at either Sedalia, Kansas City, or Grandview, is it?

Mr. GROSS. What I was trying to tell the gentleman is that I have traveled over the State of Missouri quite extensively.

Mr. IRVING. Has the gentleman traveled to those places since the installations have been put there?

Mr. GROSS. No; I have not seen the base at St. Joseph, Mo., which today is abandoned, which today could be used. It was an active base in World War II.

Mr. IRVING. I desire not to yield to bring in St. Joseph.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri may be extended five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. As I say, I do not desire to yield to discuss St. Joe, which was not brought into this debate at all. I asked the gentleman to say whether he had been at Grandview or at Sedalia since the installations had been put there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I can tell the gentleman that the St. Joseph base will be brought into the discussion later on.

Mr. IRVING. Well, that could be. I think the gentleman has not clarified or answered me as to the other two; however, I am taking it for granted that he has not been there; and, certainly, he could not refer to the Grandview airport as a cow pasture if he had.

The Sedalia air base lies about 70 miles south of Kansas City, and there is only one railroad line that runs to it. I traveled to Jefferson City, which is the capital of Missouri, on several occasions and up there at Knob Noster, which is the correct name of the town nearest to the air base there—I saw hundreds and hundreds of airmen on Saturdays and Sundays trying to hitch-hike rides to Kansas City. Knob Noster is a very small town; it cannot be expected to have too many recreational or cultural advantages, and they wanted to get to Kansas City where we do have them, where we have an art gallery, where we have universities and colleges, where we have veterans' hospitals and other hospitals also excellent libraries, theaters, golf courses, parks and fine churches. I think definitely that the Grandview airport because of its close proximity to these advantages is a perfect location for any kind of a military installation. Not only is it advantageous for reasons of morale but also from the transportation angle being more economical and efficient both for the military personnel, also for the relatives as well. There is going to be a great deal of money spent at Sedalia, and the two can be worked in conjunction, I believe.

I think it is much sounder thinking and that it will save money. If it is not advisable to have it all at Grandview, then have one at Sedalia and one at Grandview as has been proposed in this bill. It will perhaps provide additional protection. In case one were attacked the other would be available. However, in expressing my thoughts, I am saying this without any feeling of

selfishness because as I said at the beginning, Grandview does not lie in my district and I am sure that the people of Grandview have not been too interested in having an installation there. Further, I am sure that the President would not and has not in any way influenced anybody because I think the record will show that there has been no money spent in Missouri since Mr. Truman has been President that was not warranted. There has been no flood of money poured into Missouri, and we are not going to have any indiscriminate expenditure of the taxpayers' money in our State.

I believe conscientiously that this is a good site for the installation that the Armed Services and the defense program have called for.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. Gladly.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of conditions with respect to recreation to Knob Noster which existed, I believe, in World War II. Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. IRVING. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. With the building of the installation at Grandview, Mo., does the gentleman mean to say that is going to solve this problem at Knob Noster where \$22,500,000 is being spent?

Mr. IRVING. I did not attempt to say that, my friend; the gentleman is the one who was worried about Grandview. In supporting Grandview I am not opposing Knob Noster; the people who are in charge of this program probably think there is enough there on the basis of the two locations that they have recommended. It must be borne in mind that wherever these developments are placed, there is going to be considerable military and civilian personnel required for the base, and there is more adequate housing and better facilities in Jackson County than there is in many other areas.

Mr. GROSS. Just how will the creation of an air base at Grandview, Mo., serve to alleviate what the gentleman says is a bad recreational condition at Knob Noster. That is the statement the gentleman made a while ago.

Mr. IRVING. I tell you frankly I do not know, but if you divide 10,000 people between two bases, at least 5,000 of them will have better advantages and there will not be such an overload on the base that does not have as good recreational facilities.

The gentleman spoke of several notable people from Missouri in a critical manner. We do have some very distinguished people coming from Missouri, Kimbrough Stone, Champ Clark, Bennett Clark, Rose Wilder Lane, Dewey Short, Thomas Hart Benton, Arthur Hyde, Mark Twain, and many others. I suppose that they have some very distinguished people coming from Iowa. I can think of two that I am sure the gentleman is very proud of. One is ex-President Hoover and the other is Henry Wallace. So we all have

our distinguished people in the various States.

I congratulate the Department of Defense for recommending this project. I also congratulate the Armed Services Committee for reporting it in this bill, H. R. 4914. It is an important part in our over-all national defense. The authorization of this project should remain in the bill. When the vote on final passage comes tomorrow I urge my colleagues to defeat the Gross amendment.

In conclusion I will say that since taking my seat in Congress I have worked and voted for economy in Government through the elimination of waste, extravagance, inefficiency, duplication, and overstaffing. Further, I have personally practiced economy in the affairs of my office. Therefore, I do not hesitate to oppose the gentleman's amendment because I honestly think the author is on the wrong track in this case. I do desire to compliment the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] upon his efforts to bring about the economies that I have stood for and will say to him that I will cooperate with him and all others in such efforts. His calling to the attention of the House some of the situations where waste, extravagance, and even fraud seem apparent, is highly commendable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

A MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest disasters of the century is now being experienced by the people in the Missouri Valley area—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me why the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING] omitted the name of Harry S. Truman from the list of notables who came from Missouri?

Mr. RANKIN. No, but I will give the gentleman from Iowa some information that ought to be more helpful to him, if he will just listen.

As I was saying, the people along the Missouri River and its tributaries are today suffering from one of the greatest disasters of this country, a disaster that could have been averted if the Congress had passed the bill which I have been sponsoring for many years to establish and develop a Missouri Valley Authority, such as we have on the Tennessee. Let me emphasize at this point what I have said time and time again, that the only way to develop the natural resources of that great midwestern area, prevent such disasters in the future, provide navigation on the Missouri River all the

way up to Fort Benton, Mont., supply water for irrigation purposes, conserve the soil, and generate and distribute that vast wealth of hydroelectric power that is now going to waste, is through the development of a Missouri Valley Authority.

I did not attempt to interrupt the "Alphonse and Gaston" demonstrators here today in their discussions of the Missouri Valley Authority. I thought I would wait until I had an opportunity to give the House some information relative to this proposition.

I was coauthor with Senator Norris of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I have fought its battles from that day to this. I am proud of the record it has made. The TVA has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times, and if Congress will do the same thing on the Missouri River, you will render the greatest service to the people of the 10 States most vitally affected of anything that could be done at the present time. It would be of immeasurable value, now and for a century to come, to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming—to say nothing of its benefits to the rest of the country.

This water should be used, first, for irrigation. There are untold thousands of acres of land along those tributaries that could be supplied with water for irrigation and soil conservation purposes. I can think of nothing that would be worth more to the arid areas of the Northwest than to have this water available at all times. This Authority would also control the floods on the main stream and its tributaries, and prevent these horrible disasters in the future. It would also provide navigation all the way up to Fort Benton, Mont., and protect the people in that area from exorbitant overcharges in transportation rates; at the same time it would generate more than 40,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity, or more than twice as much as the people in the 10 States in that area are now using, and supply it to them at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution—thereby saving them untold billions of dollars on their electric light and power bills in the years to come.

A valley authority would build dams at the proper places, on the main stream and its tributaries, and coordinate them in such a way as to prevent these flood damages in the future.

In addition to that, it would prevent the flood waters on the Missouri River from synchronizing with the floods on the Ohio and the upper Mississippi and cut the flood crest on the lower Mississippi to such an extent as to save billions of dollars on flood control on the lower Mississippi in the years to come.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question only because my time is limited.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I regret that the gentleman was not here when

we discussed flood control in the Missouri River Basin, and I would suggest that the gentleman investigate the programs that are now on the way.

Mr. RANKIN. I have already investigated them. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I have followed these investigations for years and years and years.

In addition to that, let me show you what a vast wealth of electric energy is now going to waste in those streams. You will shut the door of hope in the faces of the people of that area for generations to come, if you prevent the development of a Missouri Valley Authority. Why do I say that? There is going to waste now in the Missouri River and its tributaries 41,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity a year, or more than twice as much as those ten States are now using. The year I came to Congress the whole country used only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt hours, or 4,000,000,000 kilowatt hours less than is now going to waste on the Missouri River and its tributaries every year. The same power trust lobbyists that you see swarming around this Capitol now, told us then that we did not need the power in the Tennessee River. They said we did not need any more electricity, that we really had more power than we needed. Last year the people of this country used 329,000,000,000 kilowatt hours, or, approximately ten times as much as they used then, and the demand for more power is greater today than it has ever been before.

At that time I dare say there was not three farm homes out of every 100 that even had electric lights.

Today, as a result of the rural electrification program, that was started by the Tennessee Valley Authority 18 years ago, we now have approximately 90 percent of the farm homes of this country electrified; and the people in the rural areas are living on a standard of which they had never dreamed. I have led this fight for rural electrification during all these years, and I am familiar with its progress in every State in the Union. I do not hesitate to say that it is the greatest economic blessing that ever came to a farm home. It has taken to the farmers of the Nation everything they have in the cities, except the noise and city taxes, lifted the burden of drudgery, brightened the homes and added immeasurably to the strength of the Nation.

This 41,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity that is now going to waste in the Missouri River and its tributaries every year could be firmed up to the peak of the average year with 15,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of steam power, which would raise the production to 56,000,000,000 kilowatt hours a year, or more than two and a half times the amount of power now used in the 10 States affected. That 56,000,000,000 kilowatt hours would be equal to the strength of approximately 24,000,000 men working 10 hours a day 300 days a year. In other words, if every individual man, woman, and child living in those 10 States were a strong man, that power that is now going

to waste would exceed the combined strength of every one of them working 8 hours a day 300 days a year.

You have there a wealth richer than the diamond mines of Golconda; the greatest resource in the area, outside of the soil from which you live.

Do you propose to let this vast wealth continue to go to waste?

Do you propose to have the Power Trust take it over and bleed your people with exorbitant power rates in the years to come?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The advocates of the Missouri Valley Authority have not recommended any dam and reservoir to provide irrigation that is not now part of the Sloan plan. They have recommended no dam that is not now part of the Army engineers' program. They have recommended no development of public power. It is merely an attempt to get political control.

Mr. RANKIN. I heard all that "bunk" 20 years ago.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The program is not that old.

Mr. RANKIN. They used the same argument against the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Missouri Valley Authority has not been created yet. Therefore, it has not made any surveys; no attempt has yet been made to coordinate that development and make it one great project that would save the people of that area billions of dollars in the years to come. The statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] a few moments ago about the employment of additional "hundreds of thousands of Government employees" by the Missouri Valley Authority was simply ridiculous, as everyone knows who is familiar with the work of the TVA.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have great respect for the gentleman's opinion on this matter. I wonder, though, if he is aware of the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority work, as far as this power project was concerned, was all in the blueprint stage of the Army engineers in exactly the way the Pick-Sloan plan is now in the blueprint stage of the Missouri Valley, and that the TVA, as far as power was concerned, was planned by the Army engineers.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Missouri has been misinformed. The engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority laid down the program and moved forward with the development.

So far as the Pick-Sloan plan is concerned, I think that is the right name for it. It is a plan to pick the pockets of the power consumers under the Sloan program. Under it your people would pay through the nose for the next 100 years in overcharges for their electricity.

I will give the gentleman some idea of what they are being overcharged now.

The householders are not using near the electricity in that area that they are using in the Tennessee Valley area; but they are paying more than twice as much for it as they would be paying in the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. First, I would like to see if the gentleman would join the States' righters in this thing. In the second instance, does the gentleman have any figures as to how the power users are being robbed in Nebraska?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, certainly.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. What are they?

Mr. RANKIN. I will give them to the gentleman. This is for 1949. Your residential consumers do not use half as much power per capita as they do in Tennessee, but you would if you had this power available.

The gentleman wants to know about Nebraska. Nebraska paid \$31,000,000 for \$17,000,000 worth of electricity.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. But it was all provided as public power, was it not?

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, you were overcharged \$14,000,000. If you will add that up in bushels of wheat and corn, and divide it out among the counties and let the farmers of that State know what it would take in corn and wheat to pay that overcharge, you will have such a ground swell of support for the Missouri Valley Authority that you will all be apologizing for the rest of the session for the speeches you made here today.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. The gentleman should know there is not a private power company in the State of Nebraska.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand there is not, and if you had this cheap water power in the Missouri and its tributaries available you would save that \$14,000,000 of overcharges every year, and more, for you would use more electricity and get more benefits for less money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think the gentleman misunderstood what I was driving at a moment ago.

Mr. RANKIN. Probably so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Here it is. What I was driving at was this: If you should adopt a Missouri Valley Authority for the Missouri Valley Basin you would go right ahead and take exactly the Pick-Sloan plan to develop the dams and power.

Mr. RANKIN. No, no. We would not do anything of the kind. We would follow the policy laid down by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

As I said, we would develop the navigation of the Missouri River all the way up to Fort Benton in Montana. In that way, if there was any attempt on the part of anyone to reimpose the one-way freight rates we have just got rid of, you

would certainly have a defense. Besides, it would provide you with water rates all through that section. There is no use talking about the Missouri River being any different from the Tennessee River. This water is coming largely from the upper Missouri River and its tributaries. Twenty-five billion kilowatt-hours of electricity goes to waste in the Missouri River and its tributaries above Sioux City, Iowa, every year. All those States are entitled to that power. When you firm it up to the peak of the average year, the chances are that it will amount to 35,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. It amounts now to more than the entire area is now using. Those 10 States are overcharged \$230,000,000 a year for their electric power today.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENSEN. How many square miles are there in the TVA area?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know exactly. One gentleman from Tennessee says about 80,000. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

I have got every precinct in every county in the district I represent connected up with the TVA. Where they had less than 1 percent of their farms electrified 18 years ago, today they have about 95 percent of them electrified. Those people are living on a standard they had never dreamed of before. The TVA has developed 600 miles of navigation on the Tennessee all the way from Paducah up to Knoxville. Today the TVA is producing 17,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, and distributing it all over that area.

Thank heaven electricity cannot be exported. The power generated on the Missouri River and its tributaries cannot be shipped abroad, but must be used at home. It belongs to the people in that area.

Here is a table showing the amount of electricity used in each one of the 10 States in the Missouri Valley area, the amount paid for it, what it would have cost, and the savings under the TVA rates.

The table referred to follows:

State	Kilowatt-hours used in 1949	Revenues	Area served by TVA	
			Revenues under TVA rates	Savings under TVA rates
Colorado.....	1,427,792,000	\$35,416,100	\$18,407,367.00	\$17,008,733
Iowa.....	3,090,042,000	78,341,900	37,421,575.00	40,920,325
Kansas.....	2,366,305,000	54,010,600	26,703,369.00	27,307,231
Minnesota.....	3,653,635,000	94,490,800	44,506,398.00	49,984,402
Missouri.....	5,006,567,000	105,711,800	55,553,240.00	50,158,560
Montana.....	2,159,178,000	22,425,700	13,548,291	8,877,409
Nebraska.....	1,370,043,000	31,581,100	17,113,326	14,467,774
North Dakota.....	415,919,000	14,919,400	6,119,047	8,800,353
South Dakota.....	448,077,000	14,944,500	5,853,286	9,141,214
Wyoming.....	282,478,000	7,635,400	3,540,280	4,095,120
Total.....	20,220,036,000	459,477,300	228,766,179	230,761,121

If you apply those figures to the 56,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours this Missouri Valley Authority would produce, when firmed up to the peak of the average year, the savings would amount to something like \$600,000,000 a year.

Remember the people on the lower Mississippi have a right to protection from these vast floods which come down the Missouri River, down the upper Mississippi River and down the Ohio. Whenever they synchronize, it means disaster to everything from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans, La., and below. I am appealing to you as an American, who has carried on this battle for the last 20 years, to join in the fight to protect the people of that great section, known as the Missouri Valley area, from these devastating floods, furnish them with water to irrigate their lands, provide the navigation, to which they are entitled and generate this vast wealth of power to enrich that area for centuries to come.

I have taken more abuse from the Power Trust lobbyists than any other man in the Congress, with the possible exception of Senator Norris. I know what it means. I have not been sectional. I have not tried to discriminate against any area in power development, or in rural electrification, but I have demanded that we extend it to every

farmhouse that can be reached by the draft in time of war, or that the tax collector can find in times of peace. It has made a new day, a new standard of living for the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I supported the gentleman in the Tennessee Valley Authority and all of the hard fights we had. In connection with the Missouri Valley Authority, the gentleman has very ably referred to the marshaling of our natural resources for the benefit of the people. But in addition to that, primarily, there is the protection of life and property.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the primary thing. Even with that, we prevent this tremendous waste of our natural resources as we did in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that this will be of tremendous value from the standpoint of national defense. We had the same opposition when we were trying to develop the Columbia River. I am one man who never flickered. I went all down the line in

support of the development of the Columbia River. What do you suppose we would have done during the last war if we had not had the TVA and the Columbia Valley developments? You would never have had the atomic bomb.

We do not know what is ahead of us. We do not know where we are headed. We do not know what we are likely to get into. We are going to need every one of these streams developed to the last degree in order to protect this country. Because if we keep on, we are likely to find ourselves fighting a defensive battle on our own soil to save America for Americans.

The thing to do now is to develop these streams in the right way. Let us pass the bill providing for a Missouri Valley Authority at once. If there are any provisions in it which you do not like, say so, and we can change them.

As I pointed out, this so-called Pick-Sloan plan would pick the pockets of the power consumers under the Sloan program. The power trust is trying to get its hands on all of the water power of this country. Then they could spiral their overcharges for electricity and run the rates so high that the American people would find themselves in a state of economic bondage.

Let me give you an example. A few years ago the Congress, over my protest, authorized the telephone trust to buy out its competitors, thereby establishing a telephone monopoly. As a result, the farmers' telephones were taken away from them, and rates have been increasing by leaps and bounds from that day to this.

I pay \$6.04 a month for a telephone in my home in Tupelo, Miss., if I never pick up the receiver. The average consumption of electricity for the residential consumers of that city for the month of May was 233 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid \$2.75—less than half the amount I paid for my telephone.

I hope every Member of Congress, and everyone else who reads this Record, will take up his telephone bill and find what this monopoly is charging him for a telephone in comparison with the rates for electric lights and power in the Tennessee Valley area. A man told me today that he had just returned from visiting a relative in Kentucky who lived 6 miles from town and that his telephone bill was \$13.48 a month, if he never picked up the receiver.

I pay as much for a telephone in my apartment here in Washington, if I never pick it up, as I ordinarily paid for both gas and electricity in the same apartment.

Let me repeat what I said in the beginning, that the water power of this Nation is the greatest wealth the American people possess, outside of the soil from which we live. In 1921, as I pointed out awhile ago, the American people used only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Last year, 1950, they used 329,000,000,000, or approximately 10 times as much as they used then.

We have 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power now going

to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. It could be firmed up to the peak of the average year with 116,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam power—making a total of 510,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, which added to the three hundred and twenty-nine billion used last year, would make a total of 839,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours—which would be enough to operate every factory and every business establishment, electrify every home, and heat every dwelling house in America.

Why should we appropriate untold billions of dollars for similar developments in foreign countries at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, and refuse to develop our own resources and enrich our own people?

I began this battle for cheap electricity for the American people the year I came to Congress, when the Muscle Shoals Dam on the Tennessee River had not been completed. As soon as it was finished, I started the drive to get that power distributed to the people within the distribution radius, and the rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

One of the greatest supporters I had back in the old days before we created the TVA was a Member from Kansas. I was trying to get the power at Muscle Shoals distributed at a maximum rate fixed by the Federal Government, in order to prevent the robbery that was going on in exorbitant power rates in that area. One of the strongest supporters I had was the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, the Honorable Homer Hoch. His party was in power, and we agreed to have him introduce the bill, which he did. We passed it twice, and two Presidents, Coolidge and Hoover, vetoed it; but later, when we passed the TVA Act in 1933, one of the things I demanded was that we put in it the right of the TVA to fix maximum retail rates for electricity, which we did.

That is the yardstick about which you have heard so much. In doing that we saved the American people billions of dollars on their light and power bills. You are getting the benefit of it. You would probably be paying 25 cents a kilowatt-hour all over Nebraska and Iowa, all over Missouri, all over the country, if it had not been for the Tennessee Valley Authority and its yardstick rates.

Let us not sit here and permit our natural resources go to waste; let us not sit here and let a little group of selfish interests that have their parking place in Wall Street take over the Government and plunder the American people in exorbitant power rates.

In the interest of the people you represent, in the interest of all the American people, I appeal to you to pass this bill creating the Missouri Valley Authority. Let us save our natural resources, promote the prosperity of that great western region, save the southern stretch of the Mississippi River from further destructive floods, and save the people of Kansas and Nebraska from a repetition of the disasters they are now experiencing. Let us develop our own resources,

build up our own country, and save America for Americans.

I thank you.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and to include an editorial.

Mr. GRAHAM, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, in three instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. McVEY, and to include a newspaper editorial entitled "Woe at West Point," from the Daily Calumet, a newspaper of Chicago, Ill.

Mr. JONAS, and to include an editorial.

Mr. BAKER, and to include an editorial.

Mr. GOLDEN, and to include a magazine article.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include a letter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and to include excerpt from a letter.

Mr. FLOOD in three instances.

Mr. BEALL, and to include an editorial.

Mr. DORN, and to include an article.

Mr. MULTER, in three instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK, in two instances, and to include an article in each.

Mr. LARCADE, and to include an editorial relating to the Kansas-Missouri flood.

Mr. BARTLETT, in two instances, and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and to include an address delivered by Mr. Justice Almond, of the Supreme Court of Georgia, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$276.

Mr. RAMSAY, and to include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE, in three instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY, and to include an editorial.

Mr. AANDAH, and to include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), and to include an editorial.

Mr. BECKWORTH (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and to include an article by the Baxter International Economic Research Bureau on the question, "How strong is Russia?"

Mr. HOPE, to revise and extend his remarks made this afternoon and include extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. MEADER, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. McCORMACK, and to include an address made by Joseph B. Spang, Jr., president of the Gillette Safety Razor Co., notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$266.50.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the week.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3782. An act to authorize a per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3782. An act to authorize a per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 14, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

709. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a letter relative to a request by Brooklyn College for a donation of the bell of the U. S. S. *Brooklyn* (Brooklyn College is eligible to receive obsolete material from the Navy Department under the provisions of Public Law 649, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

710. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Development of Areas of Understanding Between the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

711. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report

of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Rates of Return for 520 Identical Companies in 25 Selected Manufacturing Industries, 1940, 1947-50"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

712. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

713. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of laws enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act for Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

714. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 384. Resolution for consideration of S. 349, an act to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense; without amendment (Rept. No. 845). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4027. A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Chow Hsia and her son, Sven Erik Hsia; with amendment (Rept. No. 847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of George Lukes; with amendment (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2669. A bill for the relief of Maria Sarandrea; with amendment (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7371. A bill for the relief of Megumi Takagi; with amendment (Rept. No. 850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3818. A bill for the relief of Yutaka Nakaeda; with amendment (Rept. No. 851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4688. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Wahls; without amendment (Rept. No. 852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4756. A bill for the relief of George Francis Hammers; without amendment (Rept. No. 853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5131. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5132. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5133. A bill to liberalize the requirements for appointment in the Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 5134. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide retirement benefits for certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5135. A bill to provide that all fines collected by the United States commissioners in Alaska for traffic violations be covered into the Territorial treasury for the benefit of the Territorial highway patrol system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 5136. A bill to provide a 15 percent increase in old-age retirement and survivors benefits payable under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENNY:

H. R. 5137. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5138. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior certain lands on which the Seattle Fish and Wildlife Service Laboratory is located; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 5139. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Union National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 148; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Res. 385. Resolution relative to Members' incomes and voting records; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 386. Resolution amending rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives to authorize committees to establish a quorum of less than a majority for the purpose of taking sworn testimony; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to confirming notification of ratification of the interstate civil defense compact enacted by the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to the interstate compact on civil defense and disaster relief; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 5140. A bill for the relief of Doris Mary Pribram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 5141. A bill for the relief of John Musich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 5142. A bill for the relief of two Missionary Sisters Servants of the Holy Ghost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 5143. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edmund Howe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 5144. A bill for the relief of Isadore I. Kurhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 5145. A bill for the relief of Tsutako Kuroki Masuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 5146. A bill for the relief of Helena Shostenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

383. By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Petition of the Reverend Ernest E. Horth and 40 citizens of Madison, Wis., urging legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television, in magazines and newspapers, in order to protect children who are being led to believe by such advertising that alcohol is harmless and that crime is glorified; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

384. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mrs. Nick Humphrys and 15 other residents of

Clackamas County, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

385. Also, petition of Rev. Paul N. Roth and 31 other members of the Calvary Menonite Church, Barlow, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

386. By Mr. RABAUT: Resolutions of the Allied Veterans Council of Michigan, Inc., urging certain changes in the Federal Civil Defense Act and certain appropriations for civil defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

387. Also, resolutions of the Allied Veterans Council of Michigan, Inc., urging reinstatement of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and certain appropriations for the Veterans' Employment Service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

388. Also, resolutions adopted by the thirty-second annual encampment of the Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging the continuance of the Veterans' Employment Service and the reinstatement of the unemployment features of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

389. Also, resolution of the thirty-second annual encampment of the Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars, endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway and requesting the passage of legislation thereon now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.